A

DISCOURSE

OF THE

FORBEARANCE

OR THE

PENALTIES

Which a Due

REFORMATION

REQUIRES.

BY

H. THORNDIKE, One of the Prebends of *Weſtminſter* Church.

LONDON,
Printed by *J. M.* for *James Collins*, at the *Kings-Head* in *Weſtminſter-Hall*, 1670.

UMI

THE PREFACE.

ARistotle *and Experience teacheth us, that no* Positive Law *can provide for all the Cases, that may arise upon the Terms of it. Religion indeed, in General, is a Moral Vertue; But the true Religion, that bringeth Salvation, is a* Positive *Constitution of Gods Grace, requiring the Condition of Christianity, to qualifie for the Promise of life everlasting. But upon several Terms, heretofore, under the Law of Nature and* Moses, *and now, under the Christian Faith. The Church of Christ, in all Ages, hath been constrained, to provide new Decrees, and seek new Laws, for the quenching of new Heresies and Schisms. They that ever hoped to do that, by an Act of* Comprehension, *which the Act of* Uniformity *hath not done, would have proved themselves* deceitful Workers; *They would have made many Breaches, by stopping of One. That which I am able to pro-*

pound, I confeſs, is rather poſſible than probable. For, were it ſo far advanced, as to be inacted for a Law of the Kingdom; I ſhould never believe, that it would take effect; unleſs the Faith and the Laws of the Catholick Church might be received, to give Bounds to all emergent Diſputes. No more then I can believe, that the Reformation will ever prevail, after one Breach *in* Germany, *after another ſince in the* United Provinces, *and theſe laſt here amongſt us; unleſs we unite our ſelves upon the ſame Principle. Whether I have ſaid enough to prove it well grounded, or not, I muſt refer that to Judgment. But he that excuſes me not, in ſuch an innocent* Propoſition *as this; How would he have Almighty God to excuſe me, if, having attained this* Reſolution, *I ſhould not declare the Conſequence of it, in our preſent Caſe? Eſpecially, conſidering the Duty, which the Law of the Land, juſtly and neceſſarily impoſes upon all of my Order; to Reduce* Recuſants *to Church. For, there are now* two ſorts of Recuſants: *And thoſe that are bound to reduce them, muſt do it upon ſuch Reaſons, that by reducing the one ſort, they drive not the other ſort from Church. Let them*

them that have more skill then I ſhew, how it can be done, without imploying my Principle. I, that am reſolved, it can by no other means be done, muſt declare my Reſolution, though I were to ſuffer for it; Which, from a Chriſtian Kingdom, *I cannot do. One thing I have adventured, upon my own Head; Granting, that the Government of the Church was* Regular, *till after the ſixth General Council: And ſo, that the Acts of the Church before that time, are effects of it. But that is not to ſay, that the* Corruption *of the Church, which we* Proteſt *againſt, and* Reform, *began not till that time. Religion began to be corrupted earlier in ſome, and later in other* Points. *But this Corruption had not the force of* Law, *till after that time: And eſpecially, till the Uſurpation of the See of* Rome. *It is enough, that there is a difference* Viſible, *in any Point, between that which was* from the beginning, *according to the Scriptures, and that which was, when the Reformation was attempted. That which can be made out hereof, will ſerve to cramp both ſorts of Recuſants: That which cannot, ſhould be no cauſe of difference. He that reduces the* ſenſe of the Scripture, within the Faith

Faith and the Laws of the whole Church, *warrants the Penalties of Recuſants. Let the Laws do their* Office, *and make it a* Diſgrace, *to be out of the Church; And then we may expect, to ſee the Bleſſing of God, upon his own Ordinance. But without reſtoring Diſcipline, without Canons and Laws to reſtore it, without the Office of the Synods, in providing thoſe Canons, let no man think, that temporal Penalties will ſerve to do the buſineſs. For, though there can be no reaſon ſufficient, for violating the Unity of the Church; yet, if the diſſatisfaction that hath cauſed it, reſolve into a defect of the Laws, it can no more be ended, without redreſſing the Laws, then a Diſeaſe can be cured, without taking away the Cauſe of it.*

Errata. *corrigantur*

PAg. 10. lin. 13. r. Propheſies ſent, ſince the Ground o Salvation was declared, is--- p. 17. l. 5. the Church, read *this Church*, p. 20. l. 27. the Article of this Church, r. *the Law of this Kingdom*, p. 22. l. 3. Chriſtians, r. *Chriſtian*, p. 25. l. 27. decay, r. *decays*, p. 36. l. 1. or to be believed to, r. *to be believed or to*, p. 42. l. 29. Laws, r. *Law*, p. 63. l. 20. the beſt, r. *their beſt*, p. 99. l. 28. Churches, r. *Church*, p. 109. l. 28. making, r. *and making*, p. 113. l. 5. Chriſts, r. *Chriſt*, p. 121. l. 12. which, r. *of whom*, p. 125. l. 21. to come to, r. *come to*, p. 151. l. 17. Idolaters, r. *Idolatry*, p. 153. l. 18. Invocations, r. *Invocation*, p. 263. l. 16. theſe, r. *thoſe*.

OF THE FORBEARANCE OR PENALTIES Which a due Reformation requires.

CHAP. I.

The Caſe, in which forbearance is pretended for weak Conſciences.

IT is a long time, that the *forbearance* due to tender Conſciences hath been alledged, for the means to reſtore Unity in this Church. And certainly, were the Caſe ſtated, in which S. *Paul* preſcribed it to the Church of *Rome*, that ſo it might be drawn into Conſequence in our Caſe; the Scripture muſt needs produce that which would be of advantage for Peace, without prejudice to Truth. But, when

the bare Phraſe of Scripture is toſſed up and down, in the diſcourſe of them that care not to underſtand, either the Reaſon upon which it is grounded, or the Effect to which it ſorteth; no marvel to ſee the decay of Religion proceed from the abuſe of the Scripture. We need not the Hereſies of the Primitive Times; even the abominable Villanies of the *Gnoſticks*; to tell us, what irreligious pretenſes may be ſet forth in Scripture Phraſe. Our own Fanaticks would furniſh ſport enough, with the fooleries which they pretend, as from Gods Spirit, becauſe they can deliver their non-ſenſe in the Phraſe of Scripture; could ſuch irreligious madneſs move any thing, but the compaſſion and lamentation of Chriſtians. It is enough for my purpoſe, that, unleſs the Precept of the Apoſtle be limited to that conſequence, which the reaſon of the Caſe will produce; the two-edged Sword of the holy Scripture may prove an edge tool, to cut their ſhins with, who take upon them, and have not the skill to handle it. For the ſtate of the Caſe, to which S. *Paul* ſpeaks, I will ſay no more at preſent, but this; That he preſcribeth only to the Church of *Rome*, at that time, when the care

care was, not to loose the Jews, by winning the Gentiles to be Christians. There could then be no question, of establishing a National Church, by the Law of a Kingdom; which Church, and which Kingdom shall, by that Law, reform that which it protesteth to have been decayed, and depraved, in the Faith and Laws of the then present Church. We have a Reformation established by certain Laws of the Kingdom; which, all men know, how great a part of the Kingdom declineth, because the See of *Rome* disclaimeth it. And therefore the question is, what that Law should be, that may oblige Recusants, to the Reformation which we profess. For, division in Religion can never so deprave mens senses, as to punish them for refusing that, which they are not obliged to embrace. And yet, who would have the Kingdom to establish that Reformation, which they would not have it inact by competent Penalties? Now, such is our Case, that, since the afflictions, which this Nation hath been visited with, have revived the humor of departing into Conventicles, Independents and Fanaticks decline Communion with this Church, as much as Recusants; And, if we will speak properly, to be understood

according to the Laws, we must distinguish them, by the addition of *Popish* or *Fanatick* Recusants. Whereupon the question arises, what Penalties are competent to the one & to the other; whether the same or diverse. For, as there can be no Law, if there can be no Penalties to enact it with; So, there can be no Penalty, unless the Legislative Power be Judge of the Cause, why the Parties decline the Law; and may secure them in Conscience, that they ought not to decline it. Can any Christian Power punish the disobeying of that Law, concerning which, it cannot secure the Consciences of them that obey? But there is a further difficulty in our Case, in regard of the Presbyterians; Who, whatsoever they may do, or may have done, since the time of disorder, have always pretended to the service of the Church; so far from disclaiming Communion with it. For, grant they do usurp the liberty of Conventicles, to hold their People at the more distance, from being reduced to Law; their pretense is not, to be obnoxious to the Law, for violating it, but to make the Law obnoxious to themselves, by reforming it. Suppose we them then, comprehended with the Clergy,

(whose

(whoſe Authority is included in the preſent Laws) in the ſame Priviledge, of miniſtring in and to the Church; Our Caſe is not ſtated, till we conſider that, which all Pulpits ring of, that *no Religion* ſtands to be the Religion of the Kingdom. The Caſe was like to come to this, when *Cromwell* firſt uſurped. For then it began to appear, that this would be the fruit of his Courſe, in maintaining all Parties in the Religions, which the licentiouſneſs of the War had allowed them to exerciſe. The Laws having recovered poſſeſſion, and the diſpute remaining, by what Penalties to be exerciſed, whether any or none, whether thoſe that are, or what others; I need not ſay, that there is any Profeſſion of Atheiſm; (which could never be profeſſed among the very Gentiles) This I ſay, that, whoſoever favours it, will neceſſarily ſhelter himſelf under the Law, profeſſing that which it maintaineth. And therefore, that it is to come into the ſtate of our Caſe, in which, Forbearance is demanded for tender Conſciences; how it is to be limited; That thoſe who have No Religion, if any ſuch ſhould be, may not have the Benefit of it. So, the queſtion now in hand is of the ſame conſequence, as

if it were demanded, upon what terms the Reformation of the Church is to be ſtated. For whatſoever comes to debate, the queſtion will always be, how far we ought to depart from the Church of *Rome*. The other part of the queſtion; What Penalties the Reformation, duly ſtated, may or is to be inacted with; will depend upon this, for the greater part of it. For, what can render the ſubject of this Kingdom liable to Penalty, for not obeying the Law which our Reformation is eſtabliſhed with; but, that he is firſt bound in conſcience to embrace the Reformation, and to do the duty of a Chriſtian according to it? Only what Penalties, and how great, or or how grievous, *it* is to be, or may be inacted with; This will further require the reaſon, which makes it the duty of Chriſtian States, to joyn in Reforming the Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

That a private Perſon may be obliged to declare in it.

THis is that which obliges a private perſon, as I am, to declare his Opinion, when ſo great a concernment of his Conſcience is at ſtake. For, who could ever think the Reformation could ſtand, were not the Clergy obliged, as the Law obliges them, every one in his place, to reduce Recuſants to the Church? Or, how ſhould they either do this, or ſtand obliged to do it, if the Reaſon, upon which the Reformation, and the Law by which it is ſtated proceeds, inable them not to convince them, that they are bound in Conſcience to embrace it? Theſe hundred years hath the diſpute been on foot. Very nigh ſo long it is, ſince the Bull of *Pius* V. acquited the Subjects of the Kingdom, of their Allegiance to Q. *Elizabeth.* The Government being then jealous of that Party; thoſe that had appeared before in the *Troubles of Francford*, to challenge a ſhare in the Government of the Church,

thought this the time to ſet their pretenſions on foot. It is to be ſeen, by *Camdens* Annals, that, when the Recuſants firſt forbore coming to Church, about that time, did this Party begin to be known, by the name of *Puritans*. Ever ſince that time, did theſe embers lye raked up in deceitful aſhes, ſtill moſt appearing, when the State was moſt ſolicitous; till at length *the Party appeared in Arms* againſt the late King; and, prevailing in thoſe Arms, became divided into thoſe ſeveral Parties, which remain united in the Plea for *tender Conſciences*. For, the Laws recovering by His Majeſties return, the ſame embers, which it was then thought fit to rake up again, in the ſame deceitful aſhes, upon the firſt rub, have flamed out again, to demand Law, to juſtifie that which they *uſurp*, by way of *Fact*, againſt Law; Both pleading, that their Conſciences cannot be ſubject to any Law in the Caſe; and that Chriſtianity hath not wherewith to clear up thoſe doubts, againſt which if they proceed, they are damned. It muſt therefore needs be ſaid, that the preſent Laws have been juſtified, beyond all contradiction, that may pretend, any thing to be commanded by the Laws, which Gods

Law

Law forbids; So that, the demand of new Laws ſeems to be a demand, that the *Concluſion* be contradictory to that which is inferred by the *Premiſes*. And, what ſhould *Weakneſs* demand of *Reaſon*, that is to give Law, but inconſequence? Only, let not inconſequence in Reaſon draw miſchief upon us in effect. We have hitherto anſwered the demand; *Where was your Church before Luther?* That it was where it is; The *ſame Church Reformed*, which was decayed and depraved afore. Neither can we ever anſwer otherwiſe, till we renounce our Creed, and deny that *One Holy Catholick Church*, which, we muſt be ſaved by believing, and by continuing in the *Unity* of it. Depart we once from theſe *terms of our Reformation*, what ſhall we plead, with a good Conſcience, to bring Recuſants to Church? It will be ſaid, that the Pope is Antichriſt, and the Church of *Rome* all Idolaters: that there can be no queſtion, of *abandoning Idolatry and Antichriſt*. But is there no queſtion of holding the true Faith, of continuing a true Church, parting with Idolatry and Antichriſt? Were Papiſts Idolaters, and the Pope Antichriſt a thouſand times, the Reaſon, and the Rule of Reforming the Church

Church would be where it is; and will require, that it be ſo Reformed, as to continue a Member of one *Catholick Church*, as it was unreformed; ſaving the Unity, which cannot be held, without the conſent of thoſe that will not be reformed. Not that I grant the pretenſe of Idolatry and Antichriſt; Or, that I intend to diſpute againſt it at preſent, being a queſtion too large to be voided, by ſo ſhort a Diſcourſe as this. But that, to ground our Reformation, and Salvation, upon the interpretation of Propheſies, is a thing without the compaſs of Reaſon to do; And alſo a departure from that *Plea*, upon which our Reformation is hitherto ſtated. Having therefore placed my buſineſs, and ſpent my time, in conſidering the Controverſies, which the Reformation hath occaſioned; Becauſe the Diſputes we have among our ſelves concern nothing, but how far we are to depart from the Church of *Rome*; I thought my ſelf tyed in Conſcience, to publiſh the Reſolution I had attained, both under the danger, that might be expected, from the late Uſurpation, and at His Majeſties happy return. So that, the publiſhing of my *Opinion in the Caſe* at this time in diſpute, is but a declaration

claration of the conſequences, that have enſued, becauſe *a palliative cure* hath not ſerved the turn. If they that break Unity in the Church, have liberty to plead for their *Conventicles*, which they *Uſurp* againſt *Law*; why ſhould not my Opinion expect a favourable Audience? Proteſting before God, that, how advantagious ſoever I think it, to the Salvation of Souls, yet I do not deſire that it ſhould take place, but by the *free Act* of this Church and Kingdom.

CHAP. III.

That the Rule of Reformation is the Catholick Church.

IN the firſt place, therefore, I hold my ſelf bound in Conſcience, upon this occaſion, freely to declare to *my Superiours*; That there is no Power in this Church and Kingdom, to reform it ſelf in matter of Religion, but only by that Form, and to that Form, which may appear to have been held by the *whole Primitive Church*, before the Corruption came in, which we pretend to Reform. And the

the reaſon hereof is unanſwerable; being immediately grounded upon the *Article of our Creed*, whereby we profeſs to believe *one Catholick and Apoſtolick Church*. For, if there be ſuch a thing in the world, then muſt there be one *Catholick Faith*, the Profeſſion whereof is the *condition of Communion* with it; And one and the ſame Laws, the violating whereof is the forfeiture of the ſame. And here I crave leave, to call all *Canons*, all *Cuſtoms* of the Church, whether concerning the *Rites* of Gods Service, or other Obſervations; whether delivered in writing, or received by *ſilent Uſe and Practice*; by one and the ſame general name, of *Laws of the Church*; Only, that I may be the better underſtood. Being therefore well aſſured, that the Church cannot be *Catholick*, but it needs muſt be *Viſible*; Becauſe it cannot be Catholick, till it may be Viſibly diſtinguiſhed, from Heretick and Schiſmatick both; I muſt alſo infer, that it can never be Viſible, till it become Catholick. That is the only way, to juſtifie that which hath been always pretended; that this Church is the ſame, that it was before *Luthers* time. For, as the Church had never been Catholick, had it been confined

ned to one Nation, as the Synagogue was; So I do believe, that it had never been called *Catholick*, had there not been Hereſies and Schiſms, before it was ſo called. It had been *One Church of all Nations*, by virtue of the Converſion of the Gentiles. When Hereſies ſprung up, as Tares among the Corn, then was it called *Catholick*, for diſtinctions ſake. It was viſible, that the true Faith was ſpread all over; Hereſies and Schiſms prevailed but here and there, where they were raiſed. So, if an Heretick or Schiſmatick were aſked the way to the *Catholick Church*, he durſt not have ſhewed the way to his own, ſaith S. *Auſtin*. Nor is it a queſtion to be aſked a Chriſtian, why the true Church ſhould be *Catholick*; The anſwer being ſo obvious, that it was *Apoſtolick*. Say why the Faith preached by the Apoſtles prevailed, why the Communion ſetled by their Authority; (whereas Hereſies and Schiſms were known but here and there) and you have ſaid, why the True Church was Catholick. We that profeſs the Reformation are agreed, that this proviſion of Gods goodneſs is no *Promiſe* of God, againſt mans malice; That corruption may become Catholick, for the preſent Age,

Age, though not from the Apoſtles. This is the common ground of Reforming the Church; If the meaſure and bounds which it limiteth were alſo common, all our diviſions were at an end. Nor can any *private Spirit*, expounding the Scripture without theſe bounds, derogate from it. It is a ſufficient prejudice, againſt any Interpretation of Scripture, that it ſtandeth not with the Faith, and with the Laws of the Primitive Church. S. *Paul* challengeth the *Prophets at Corinth*, to ſhew themſelves *Spiritual* men, by ſubmitting to his Orders; Having ſaid, that *the Spirits of the Prophets are ſubject to the Prophets*: and inferring, that *all their Spirits are to be ſubject to his*, being an Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* XIV. 32, 36, 37. The ſame is the Caſe to the Worlds end; the promiſe of our Lord, *Behold, I am with you to the worlds end*; being made to the *Apoſtles*, and to all that ſhould be Chriſts *Diſciples*, and learn *of the Apoſtles, to do all that he hath commanded*, Mat. XXVIII. 19, 20. For, who can think he continueth in the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, departing from their *Authority*, in any thing ſubject to their Authority? Or what is not ſubject to their Authority, excepting that which our Lord

Lord had commanded, before he gave them their Authority? His own Commands being the condition of Salvation; Their Authority, the means provided, to inable us to attain it, by obſerving and learning his Commands. So, as it is *Hereſie*, to depart from the Faith which they preached; ſo is it *Schiſm*, to depart from the Authority which they left in the Church, till the Worlds end. Were not the Catholick Church a Warrant to particular Churches, they could not Reform themſelves, without the conſent of the Whole. But, ſeeing abuſes are and were *viſible* at the Reformation, it is neceſſary to grant, that particular Churches (and ſecular Powers, by whoſe Laws they ſubſiſt) may reſtore that which may appear to have been decayed; But it is alſo neceſſary to ſay, that Reformation is the Reſtoring of that which was, not the introducing of that which was not.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

That the Church is no further Visible, then it is Catholick.

AND thus shall the *Church* become *Visible*, according to the Will and Ordinance of God; which, being in decay by the malice of man, though *not Invisible*, yet must needs become *hard to be seen*, at least to the purpose of Gods goodness. For, by the discourse premised it appears, why it pleased God to provide, that the true Church should be Catholick. That is to say, that when it was so easie to discern the True Church, from all that pretended, being indeed Hereticks or Schismaticks; the simplest were left without excuse, if they made a wrong choice. Which if it be true, how can it be in the Power of any Church, or of the secular Powers that maintain it, being bound to continue a Member of the whole Church, to introduce that for Reformation, which cannot appear to be restored, but may seem to be innovated? Which, how should it be done, without owning that ground

ground of Reformation, which I have delivered; and by consequence, those bounds, which the said ground inferreth? And I do very well believe, that none of those, who decline Conformity with the Church, would have the Face to deny this, had they to do with the now *Missionaries* of the Church of *Rome*. For it would not serve their turn, in answer to them, to plead, that the Pope is Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters; having Reason to challenge, that God hath founded a Visible Church. It would be absolutely necessary to plead; though the goodness of God hath *instituted* a Visible Church, yet, that, by the malice of man, it might be, and is *become Invisible*, for the difficulty of finding Salvation by it; though *absolutely Visible*, because Salvation might always be had in it. It is easie for him, that would answer them with a good Conscience, for Truth and not for Victory, to maintain the Church to be Visible, so far as the *Faith* and *the Laws* thereof continue Visible. But that, so far as the Faith and Laws thereof may be disguised, from that which was from the beginning, so far it may and is to be said, that the Church, which by Gods Ordinance is and ought to

be Viſible, by humane diſorder is become Inviſible. Which being ſaid, it follows immediately, that, as all eſtates in the Church are obliged, in their ſeveral qualities, to do their utmoſt, that the Church may be Viſible; (the Salvation of all Chriſtians requiring them to Reſort to the Communion of the Church, which they believe to be Catholick) ſo, there is no other way to make it Viſible, but to reſtore the Faith and the Laws of the Church, that from the beginning made it Viſible. And therefore, no Chriſtian Church or State can have Power, to Reform the Church any otherwiſe, then, by reſtoring that Faith, and thoſe Laws, which the Church may appear to have had from the beginning. It would be *Sacriledge*, and *Vſurpation* upon the Faith, which God hath built his Church upon; and upon the Laws, which either the Apoſtles have delivered to the Church, or inabled the Church to deliver to poſterity; to introduce any thing elſe for the Reformation of the Church. Which ſeeing it muſt needs bind over the Church and Kingdom, to the wrath of God; as either deſtructive, or at leaſt prejudicial to the Salvation of the People; muſt needs bind over him

him that hath this opinion, to the ſame, if, upon ſo juſt an occaſion, he ſhould forbear to publiſh and to plead it as he may, without offenſe. And therefore, I take leave to blame all thoſe, who declare, in behalf of this Church, that it departeth, and *ſeparateth* it ſelf from the Church of *Rome*. For, ſeeing it hath been granted, in and by this Church, ever ſince the Reformation, that there is and always was Salvation to be had in the Church of *Rome*, as a true Church, though corrupted; I am very confident, that no Church can ſeparate from the Church of *Rome*, but they muſt make themſelves thereby *Schiſmaticks before God*; though, before the Church, they cannot be condemned for ſuch, becauſe the Church of *Rome*, (the Authority whereof muſt needs be ingredient into the Sentence) cannot oblige any Body, to ſtand to the *Authority*, which it ſo abuſeth. For, if God have tied *all Churches to Communion with all Churches*, how ſhould it not be *Schiſm*, to profeſs Separation from a true Church? And it is every whit as eaſie to ſay, that we intend only to Reform our ſelves: and that the Separation hath come to paſs, by the rigour of the Church of *Rome*, Excom-

municating those that Reform themselves without her leave.

CHAP. V.

How far this Rule is owned by this Church.

HEre, it will perhaps be demanded, whether or no, the Law of this Land make this the Rule of the Reformation which we Profess. And my Answer is, that *in effect*, and *by consequence* it doth. For, by maintaining the *three Creeds* to be part of the Service, wherewith we glorifie God, by Professing the Catholick Faith; and by maintaining the *four Councils*, whereby, both the Faith, and the then Canons of the whole Church are established; it doth in effect maintain the *Primitive Church*, not only till that time, but beyond it. For, seeing it is evident, that the fifth and sixth Councils are but appendances of the Fourth; (tending only to maintain and inforce the decree of it) how can it be doubted, that the ~~Article of this Church~~ the Law of this Kingdome receiving all Councils, that have decreed according to the *Word of God*; receiveth and

and inacteth thoſe, which tend only to inforce the Fourth; which it owneth, for decreeing that Faith which the *Word of God* teacheth? Beſides the prayers for the proſperity of the *Catholick Church*; whereby we prove our ſelves no Schiſmaticks, to the See of *Rome*, when we repay the *Curſes* of it with our prayers. Beſides that *Injunction* of *Edward* the VI, which obligeth all Preachers, to expound the Scripture, according to the *Conſent of the Ancient Fathers*. Which, as no man can ſay, why it ſhould not be in force; So, had it been in force, we need not have come to the queſtion now on foot. And indeed, it is, in effect, that which I demand. For it will be found, that the *Conſent of the Fathers* is not to be had, but in the common *Faith*, and in thoſe *Laws*, which the *whole Church* either enjoyned, or allowed particular Churches. So that, to expound the Scriptures according to the *Conſent of the Fathers*, is to expound them within thoſe bounds; and to trouble the heads of Chriſtian people with nothing, that is without the ſame; As if their Salvation could be concerned, all being ſafe within thoſe bounds. Here I muſt take notice, that the reaſon, why the

Church *Catholick* is to be held, may be miſkenned; if it be extended to all that is called *Chriſtians*, and not limited to that, which, maintaining the *Faith*, violateth not the *Unity* of the Primitive Church. If the profeſſion of *Chriſt* and *Chriſtianity* were enough, to make men members of the Catholick Church, why ſhould not *Socinians* and *Anabaptiſts* belong to the Church *diſperſed over the face of the whole earth*? Again, the *Eaſtern Chriſtians*, that are thought to come from *Neſtorius*; the *Southern Chriſtians* under *Preſter John*, that maintain the memory of *Dioſcorus*, and condemn the fourth Council of *Chalcedon*, cannot be admitted to be *Catholicks*, by any man that owneth the four Councils. But, in regard it appeareth not, that they owne the *Hereſies* of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*, though they owne the memory of their *perſons*; and in regard there is cauſe enough to preſume, that they would, with all their hearts, be *reunited* to the Church, did not the See of *Rome* refuſe all terms of Re-union, that include not the *infinite Power* which it challengeth; they cannot be included within the Catholick Church without reſerving a liberty to exclude them, whenſoever, in point of Faith, it

ſhall

ſhall appear, that they owne the *Hereſies* of *Neſtorius* and *Eutyches*. As for the Canons of the Church, it was never neceſſary, to the maintenance of Communion, that the ſame *Cuſtoms* ſhould be held in all parts of the Church; It was only neceſſary, that *ſeveral Cuſtoms* ſhould be held by the *ſame Authority*. Which is to ſay; That the ſame Authority inſtituted ſeveral Cuſtoms, which they thought to be for the beſt, in ſeveral times, and in ſeveral places. For ſo, they might be changed by the ſame Authority, and yet Unity remain. Whereas, *queſtioning the Authority*; by queſtioning whether the Acts of it be *agreeable to Gods Law* or not; how ſhould Unity be maintained? This is the Reaſon of that which I ſaid even now; that the *Fathers* do not agree in any thing, but in the Faith and the Laws of the Church. For it is manifeſt, that they could not have agreed in the Laws of the Church, if any had excepted againſt any thing, uſed in any part of the Church, as if Gods Law had been infringed by it. Seeing therefore it is manifeſt, that there are certain Canons and Cuſtoms, known to have been the *Canons and Cuſtoms of the Primitive Church*, owned by this Church; it

followeth of neceſſity, that nothing can be diſowned by this Church, as *contrary to Gods Law*, which holdeth by the Primitive Church. So, it is not my intent to ſay, that the Canons and Cuſtoms of the Primitive Church ought to be in force: And, that there is no other means to reſtore Unity in the Church. But, that nothing can *cauſe a Breach* in the Church, that hath Authority from the Primitive Church. And that nothing can have Authority in the preſent Church, that infringeth the Authority of the Primitive Church; as if Gods Law were deſtroyed by any Act of it. Further, there are two points in the *Title* and *Cauſe* of the late War; *Epiſcopacy and Sacriledge*; wherein, the Cauſe of the Crown hath been ſo united to the Cauſe, both of *this* and of *the Catholick Church*, that I may well ſay, that, to diſowne the ſame Cauſe in other points, alike Primitive and Catholick, would be to deny the *Concluſion* admitting the *Premiſes*; Or to keep *divers weights and meaſures* in the ſame Budget. The Plea for *Epiſcopacy*, and for *Conſecrate Goods*, hath made out ſo much evidence for it ſelf, that it hath helped to recover the Laws of the Kingdom. And ſhall

not

not the Laws of the Kingdom, ſo recovered, maintain the ſame Plea, in all other things? For, the Viſible Unity of the Catholick Church, as it never ſubſiſted, but *in the conſent of Biſhops*, ſo was it never maintained, but *out of Conſecrate Goods.*

CHAP. VI.

What Errours have followed, becauſe it is not ſo expreſly.

BUt I do freely acknowledge, that, though this Church hath many *Obligations*, to owne this Principle, for their Rule; yet, it is not *formally* and *expreſly* inacted, by thoſe Laws of the Land, whereby Religion, and the Rights of the Church are eſtabliſhed. For I do further claim, that the want of inacting and inforcing it, and driving it home to the true Conſequence, in every point, is the Cauſe and Sourſe, not only of the diſorders, which divers pitiful plaiſters have been tendred to cure; But of all diſorders, imperfections, and decays of Religion, which have ſucceeded upon the Reformation; having been made without limiting

thoſe

thoſe bounds. And, that the preſent diſorders in Religion are the *Symptoms* of a common diſeaſe, which all men are offended with, but cannot be cured, without recourſe to the Unity of the Catholick Church, and the terms of it; wherein that health of Chriſtianity conſiſteth, which all diviſion impeacheth. I do therefore freely acknowledge, that I find two poſitions, to be the ſourſe of all thoſe *Excentrical Opinions* in Religion, which cauſed that *Confuſion*, upon the iſſue of the War, that helped to make way for his Majeſties happy Return. The firſt is, that there is *no Condition for the Covenant of Grace*; That there is no *Contract* in it, but a meer *Promiſe*. The ſecond is, that there is no ſuch thing as a *Viſible Church*, inſtituted by God; But, that men are firſt *Children of God by Faith*, then members of a Church, of free choice. Of theſe Poſitions, the one neceſſarily dependeth upon the other. For, the Faith of the whole Church from the beginning requires *Baptiſm* to Salvation. And therefore, *includeth it in that Faith*, which alone juſtifieth. And by conſequence requires, that *juſtifying Faith* cannot be underſtood, without that *Profeſſion of Faith*,

Faith, which a man maketh at his Baptiſm. And this will neceſſarily infer a Church, therefore *Viſible, becauſe Catholick.* For it is agreed upon by the whole Church, that *Baptiſm in Hereſie or Schiſm,* (That is, when a man gives up himſelf to the Communion of Hereticks or Schiſmaticks, by receiving Baptiſm from them) though it may be true Baptiſm, and not to be repeated, being given in the form of the Church; yet is not available to Salvation; making him acceſſory to Hereſie or Schiſm, that is ſo Baptized. Now, it is not my intent to ſay, that theſe two Poſitions were *expreſly and formally* profeſſed, by Companies diſtinguiſhing themſelves from others, by Eccleſiaſtical Communion in the Profeſſion; Which is the true ſignification of an *Hereſie, in the eye of the Church.* But the Poſitions I maintain to be Hereſies, in ſo much that, if there were ſuch Companies, they muſt of neceſſity be taken for Hereſies, in the account of the Church. And my Reaſon is clear. For it is acknowledged by the whole Church, clearly delivered by our Lord in the Goſpel, that the taking up of his Croſs is a neceſſary condition to Salvation. Now, ſince our Lord gave Commiſſion to his Apoſtles,

ſtles, to *Baptize all Nations in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt*; it is evident, that ever ſince, we take up Chriſts Croſs, when we undertake at our Baptiſm, to lay down our lives, rather then *deny the Faith* of Chriſt, or *tranſgreſs* his *Commandments*. And ſince this Promiſe is not available, unleſs it be depoſited with the true Church; it cannot be available, to him that continueth not in the true Church, that may exact the Promiſe depoſited with it. If any man aſk, whom I can charge with theſe Poſitions, which, I cannot ſhew to have been *Profeſſed by Viſible Bodies*; I diſcharge my ſelf upon a number of *Pamphlets*, of the time of that Confuſion, which was called the *Bleſſed Reformation*; wherein *free Grace* was made to be the *pardon of ſin before it is done*; *Juſtification* to be the *Revelation of Predeſtination to Glory*, and *no ſin to be ſeen in Gods Elect*. One particularly; which I have cauſe to believe was printed by *Cromwells* own Appointment; becauſe it anſwered a *Petition of Welſh Fanaticks*, which charged him to depart from his *Principles*; anſwers expreſly, that the Principle of Salvation is neither *Faith* nor *good Works*, but *Chriſt* living in the heart, and

and abiding there, whatever *Principles* the *Godly* may change. And for the Church, have we not ſeen our *Independent Congregations*, or, do we not ſee them in *New-England*, refuſe Baptiſm to all, that will not take *the Covenant*, which they appoint themſelves to take; and owne no other Churches, but ſuch Congregations? I ſuppoſe, no man in his right ſenſes will imagine, that there can be a Catholick Church, conſiſting in the *Communion* of all ſuch *Congregations*: Or, that there can be any Faith, to give Law to their Communion; who have the Law in their own hand, to be to morrow Socinians if they pleaſe; Or any other Sect, that allows Independent Congregations. For, the Socinians may ſeem to have the Elderſhip of *New-England*, for Independent Congregations. On the other ſide, do we not ſee the *Leviathan*, that Monſter of a Chriſtian, openly Profeſs, that he is bound to renounce Chriſt with his mouth, if his Soveraign command; Though ſtill bound to believe in him at the heart? So utterly perſwaded, that there is no ſuch thing as a Church, of Gods Ordinance; But only by the *Act of Soveraign Powers*, within the reſpective Dominions of each of them;

That

That he had rather renounce his *Baptiſm*, (and ſo the Benefit of it) then owne any *Creed*, or any *Catholick Church*.

CHAP. VII.

That it is for the Intereſt of the Reformation, as much as of the See of Rome.

HAving therefore obſerved (upon due conſideration, as I hope) that all the Errours, which have had Vogue during our late Confuſions, are reducible to theſe *two Poſitions*, deſtructive to two Articles of our Creed, that Profeſs *one Catholick Church*, and *one Baptiſm for remiſſion of Sins*; I am ſtill led by the ſame Conſideration, to think my ſelf tyed in Conſcience, freely to Profeſs; that, were theſe two Poſitions clearly renounced, and the ſenſe of thoſe two Articles duely eſtabliſhed, and received by all Parties, that owne the ſame Creed, the Re-union of the whole Church, muſt needs follow. For, the Power of the whole Church being ſo ſtated, as to preſuppoſe the whole condition of our Salvation: and to extend only, to the determining of thoſe things, which may

may promote edification in it, without endangering the Unity of the Church; why ſhould not I think, that there is found, by the conſent of the whole Church from the beginning, ſo clear a reſolution of all that is diſputed, to maintain *Separation*, concerning the Condition of the Covenant of Grace, that it cannot be refuſed by the Parties, owning the common Faith? There is great cauſe to fear, that, notwithſtanding the miſchiefs we feel by our own *Diviſions*, ſome would think it ſtill a greater miſchief, that the Whole Church ſhould be re-united; Though upon juſt Terms, and ſuch, as muſt needs re-unite our ſelves. But, if the Chriſtian Religion oblige us to do men good againſt their will; He that demands nothing, but the *Right Underſtanding* of two Articles in the Creed, to the Re-uniting of Chriſtendom, intends the greateſt Charity, that thoſe who love Diviſion can receive. Whether his demand be ſufficient to do his Work or no; he muſt leave it to the World to judge. For, it is to be acknowledged, that, when the Condition of our Salvation is ſetled, and all that cauſes Diviſion upon the Account of it; there remains, beſides,

very

very many Diſputes, concerning *Publick Orders*, as well in the *Offices of the Church*, as in the publick *Government* of it; and the Intereſt, as well of the State as of the Church, in the ſame. But, let not therefore thoſe that love not Unity pretend Difficulty. For, they ſhall find ſuch *Principles* laid, to the determining of them all, in the *Viſible Laws* of that *one Church*, which cannot continue *One*, but by owning the ſame; that the due bounds of Reformation cannot eſcape them, that will not decline the thred and the grain of theſe grounds. And yet, in all this, no man declines the Scripture for the *only Rule of Faith*. But, he that refuſes the See of *Rome* for *Judge in the Senſe of it*; which is all that remains in queſtion; may well crave leave to decline the Judgment of any *private Spirit*, not confined within the bounds, which the Viſible conſent of the Church determineth. Not as if the ſenſe of the Scripture were not more and more to be diſcovered; which is indeed diſcovered every day more and more. But, becauſe the true ſenſe of it will always fall within the compaſs of that, which the Church hath always received. I am very well perſwaded, that

the

the See of *Rome* will never hear of any Terms of Reconcilement, ſo long as they ſee our Diviſions increaſe. But I am very well aſſured, that the *Diviſions of the Reformation* can never be *Re-united*, ſo as to prevent the like for the future; but upon that Ground, which, being received, will ſerve to re-unite the Whole Church. There can never be *One Viſible Faith*, *One Viſible Church*, upon any other terms. There can be no ſuch *ſin* as *Hereſie* to violate Faith, as *Schiſm* to violate Charity, upon other terms. And therefore, it is out of Love to the Reformation, that I inſiſt upon ſuch a *Principle*, as may ſerve to re-unite us with the Church of *Rome*; Being well aſſured, that we can never be well re-united with our ſelves otherwiſe. That, not only the *Reformation*, but the *Common Chriſtianity* muſt needs be loſt, in the *Diviſions*, which will never have an end otherwiſe. And he that can take meaſure, how much of it is loſt in thirty years time, ſince theſe Troubles began; even among them that incloſe the Name of *Saints*, and *the Godly* to themſelves; will eaſily believe, that it hath not long to live, unleſs Diviſion be put to death. And yet the vain hopes of the Parties,

ever since the Division, may make it appear, that both have Reason enough to be reconciled. They of the See of *Rome* have long expected; a hundred and fifty years or thereabouts; that those Christian Princes, that have looked upon the Reformation as dangerous to the Peace of their Dominions, should give them assistance, to reduce all that *Protest* against the abuses thereof, by force of Arms, to submit to their Will. Which would be, to make that Will the Law of Religion, as well to themselves, as to those that should be so reduced. But the experience of so much time evidences, that the Powers of Christendom have something else to do, then to imploy the forces of their Dominions to that purpose: And that, if it prove for the Interest of some of them, at some times, it will prove not to be for the Interest of others, at the same or other times. Of which Interest, as they are indeed, and in *Conscience*, to give account to God, and not to the See of *Rome*; so, that they will ever make the See of *Rome* the Judge of them, what appearance can there be? So, it is time of the day for them to hearken to Reason, whether they regard God, and Religion, or

Interest,

Intereſt, and themſelves. But is not our Caſe the ſame? Or, are not we tranſported as far, with the conceit, that they are *limbs of Antichriſt* and *Idolaters*, as they are, with the conceit, that we are *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*? Have we not as long expected, when the *Kings* would joyn to ſtrip the *Whore of Babylon naked*, as they, when they would joyn to reduce the Hereticks by force? And is it not yet time of the day for us; whatſoever opinion, thoſe that imploy their time, in ſearching the meaning of a Propheſie, may have; at leaſt to make it no *Principle of our Profeſſion*, nor to maintain *Separation* upon the Account of it? Knowing, that were the Pope twenty times Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters, he can never be Antichriſt, nor they Idolaters, for any thing, that the conſent of the Catholick Church either alloweth, or injoyneth. So, that, whatever become of any Propheſie in Gods Word, and the ſenſe of it, the bounds of Reformation will be the very ſame; And he will be no leſs an *Heretick or a Schiſmatick*, that makes the Pope Antichriſt, or the Papiſts Idolaters, for doing or believing any thing, which the Church from the beginning hath in-

joyned or allowed, to be believed or to be done, then if he pretended no Propheſie to prove it. If ever any people had cauſe to reflect upon the ſad conſequences of this conceit, we are they, that ſhall find no probable reaſon, to impute the miſchiefs of the late *Uſurpation* to, but the hope of fulfilling this ſenſe of this Propheſie. It is a vain thing to think, that a man, who believed no God, could Act a counterfeited Religion throughout, as we have ſeen the Uſurper do. He that could hope to be ſaved, either without Faith, or without good Works, by having Chriſt alive at the Heart, why ſhould not he think, that all the foul way he went through was the Service of God, having intended to *ſtrip the Whore of Babylon* by his means? Neither *Manichæus*, nor *Mahomet*, nor any *Enthuſiaſt* can be barred, of the like aim with this, if once he make his *private Spirit* parallel to the Scripture. For, that which the ſame Authority *laſt* dictates, as in *Wills* and *Teſtaments*, muſt take place. I ſay not that this is the Caſe of thoſe, that interpret this Propheſie of the See of *Rome*. I believe they follow their Reaſon, in expounding *Scripture by Scripture*. But if their Reaſon be not the Reaſon of

Religion,

Religion, the Reaſon of that *Chriſtianity* which we all have Intereſt in, the private Spirit that follows it may take all for Gods Service, though never ſo wicked, that is done in proſecution of it. In the mean time, Diviſion increaſing among us as it does, I think, I gratifie our ſelves, and not the See of *Rome*, in propoſing that truth, which reconciles the *Intereſt of Reformation*, to the *Intereſt of Unity* in the Church. For in *Civil War*; as Schiſm is nothing but a Civil War in the Church; that Party that divides is the likely to Ruine. And though the firſt hopes of the See of *Rome* have proved addle, yet if our Diviſions prevail, they muſt needs have freſh hopes to prevail, by our Diviſions.

CHAP. VIII.

That it is the Duty of this Kingdom, and of all Chriſtian Soveraignties.

AND therefore, I muſt freely profeſs my opinion, without any manner of hope, that ever the See of *Rome* will abate any thing of their rigour; Though the

Reformation ſhould content themſelves with theſe terms. For, I find, by the proceeding of former times, that it is their *Maxime*, to ſtand to that which they have once done: And to mark thoſe Popes to poſterity, that have abated any thing, from the rigour of their Predeceſſors. For, being arrived at this Greatneſs, by this *Rigour* and obſtinacy in all Pretenſes, right or wrong, they will always think themſelves obliged, in *Reaſon of State*, not to yield ſo much as the *Cup in the Euchariſt*; Though the Council of *Trent* leave it in the Popes Power to grant it. Becauſe, granting, that any thing is and hath been amiſs; who ſhall ſecure them, that nothing more ſhall be queſtioned, then is indeed amiſs; when we ſee no point in Religion remain unqueſtioned, ſome time or ſome where? Not conſidering, all the While, that this Rigor is the cauſe of *Diviſion*, and Diviſion the cauſe of theſe Queſtions: And that, the Reaſon of Reformation being owned on both ſides, there is a *Ground* reſtored, for *Confidence*, that they who accept of it will ſtand to thoſe *Bounds* which it ſetleth. But, if the See of *Rome* can have no Power againſt the Whole Church; Much leſs

can

can any other Church, or any part of the Church, or any Secular Power that protecteth it, make that to be Reformation, which the Whole Church alloweth not; Or ſecure their *Subjects Conſciences* of the *Salvation* they ſeek, in exerciſing their Chriſtianity according to their Laws, but by confining the Reformation which they maintain, within thoſe Bounds, which the Faith and the Laws of the Whole Church either require or allow. Now, how can the *Intereſt of the Nation* be ſecured, without due ground, for hope of Gods bleſſing upon that which ſhall be done? How can there be ground to expect Gods bleſſing, till it appear, how all Subjects of this Kingdom ſhall ſtand diſcharged at the day of Judgment, following that form which the *Kingdom inacteth*, rather then that which the *See of Rome requireth*? For, there are other Chriſtian Princes and Soveraignties, that command their Subjects to obey the See of *Rome*; whoſe Subjects muſt as well ſtand diſcharged to God, upon the ſame Plea, as the Subjects of Reformed Princes and States. And how ſhall the *Conſciences of them that make Laws* be ſecured, if they cannot ſecure the Conſciences of them for whom they

are made? Or how can Gods bleſſing be expected, if this ſecurity cannot be *evidenced*? It is not yet time to aſk, how, thoſe that allow not the Reformation, upon theſe Terms, ſhould be puniſhed; Becauſe there are that pretend, that no puniſhment can be inflicted, for diſobeying any Law of the Kingdom, by which Religion is ſetled. But it is time to ſay, that they make it a very ridiculous thing, for the Legiſlative Power to make Laws for the Kingdom, which they can inact by no Penalty. And how ſhall this difficulty be voided, but by demanding nothing, but that which Chriſtianity will require of all Chriſtians? That no Chriſtian Kingdom can have Power, to introduce any thing, for Reformation in the Church, but that which the *Conſent of the Whole Church* either injoyneth, or alloweth. Not as if the leaſt Tittle of Scripture were not enough, to warrant, that which it injoyneth to be the Reformation of the Church. But, whereas the *ſenſe of the Scripture* is that which remains queſtionable, not the *Authority* of it; that nothing can be the true ſenſe of the Scripture, which the Conſent of the Whole Church contradicteth. And therefore, that, though there

there be an appearance of truth in such a sense, yet, it is not for a *Christian Kingdom* to inact it for *Law*, till it be duely debated. And, that being done, it will infallibly appear in all, which in most things appeareth already; that the Consent of the Whole Church cannot contradict the true sense of the Scripture; And that it is nothing else, but not knowing the one or the other, that makes it seem otherwise. If the Scripture it self is not, nor can be *owned for Gods Word*, but by the Consent of Gods people, from the beginning, attesting, the *Motives of Faith* related in the Scripture to have been infallibly done, by submitting to the Faith which they inforce; Then must the same Consent be of force, to assure common reason, that the Faith, and the Laws, wherein the whole Church agrees, came from the Authority setled by God, not by any *Consent of all Christians*, to fall from that which they Profess. And therefore, though a Kingdom may force the Subjects thereof, to *call that Reformation*, which they inact; yet they can never make it Reformation, in that sense, which the Salvation of Christians requires, if it be not within these bounds. It may be called Reformation,

to

to ſignifie a *New form*, but it can never be Reformation, to ſignifie that form *which ſhould be*, unleſs it ſignifie the form that hath been in Gods Church. For, that being *One* and the ſame, from the firſt to the ſecond Coming of Chriſt, can authorize no other form, then that which it may appear to have had from the beginning.

CHAP. IX.

That it cannot be done without the Synods of this Church.

And therefore, it being granted on both ſides, that the Soveraign Power of Chriſtian Kingdoms and States, proceeding duely, obligeth the Subjects, to ſubmit to the Reformation of the Church; and cannot exact *Legal Penalties* of them which refuſe, upon any other Terms; I do except, in the ſecond place, that it ought to proceed in all Reformation, by and upon the Authority of this Church; That is, of the Synods. For what doth the *whole Church agree in ſo Viſibly*, as in this; That the Authority which God hath inſtituted in his Church ſhould give Laws to

to his Church? And how can a Christian Kingdom promise themselves Gods blessing, upon such Acts, as they have no Power nor Right from God to do? For, granting there is such a thing as a Catholick Church; it is not possible, that any Christian Kingdom, which must be a part of it, should have Power to inact any thing *Prejudicial*, much less destructive to the Whole; to the Visible Being, which is, the Visible Communion of it. And therefore, the Faith and the Laws of the whole being the Condition, under which the parts are to communicate; no Christian Kingdom can have Power from God, to give *New Laws in Religion*, to the Subjects thereof, which the Church of the Kingdom warranteth not, to be according to the Laws of the whole Church. If any thing may appear to have been in force, in the Primitive Church, and, by the abuse of succeeding times, to have become void; I do not deny, that the Secular Power may Reform the Church, by restoring it, though the Church should *refuse their Consent* to it. The reason is, because the Church would be without help, if there were no Lawful way to restore the decays of it; Which, we agree, have come

come to paſs; without the conſent of them that are chargeable for the decay of it. Now, the Faith and the Laws of the Catholick Church are the Birth-right of all Chriſtians; Purchaſed, by undertaking to Profeſs one Catholick Church, at their Baptiſm: And Chriſtian Powers are to protect their Chriſtian Subjects in their Birth-right. And, the Authority of the preſent Church is not ſeen, in the Faith and the Laws of the Whole Church. For, it is meer matter of Fact, what they are; The evidence whereof (præexiſtent to the Authority of the preſent Church) cannot be underſtood to require, or to preſuppoſe it. And therefore, the Authority of the Church cannot be violated, by reducing the Faith and the Laws of the Primitive Church into force. Nevertheleſs, in regard, that which is decayed can ſeldom be reſtored, without determining new Bounds, which the preſent ſtate of the Church requires; It is manifeſtly the Office of the Church, to determine the ſame: Nor can it be done by Chriſtian Powers of this World, without aſſuming to themſelves that Authority, in which they are to maintain the Church. For, though Soveraign Power hath Sove-

raign

raign Right, *in all Cauſes and over all Perſons Eccleſiaſtical*, yet is it capable of no Eccleſiaſtical Power, or Right; But is to maintain thoſe that have it, by the Laws of the Church, in the uſe of it. If any thing were done at the Reformation, ſetting aſide the Synods of this Church; which, I am here neither to deny, nor to acknowledge; it muſt be juſtified upon this Account, that they refuſed the Authority of the Whole Church, in authorizing the Reformation of this Church. If any thing now may appear to be demanded upon the ſame Account; let the Authority of the Synods be paſſed by, for their puniſhment, if they hinder the Reformation of the Church, by refuſing it. But that cannot appear, till it may appear; Firſt, that the matter demanded ought to have *the force of Law* in the Church; having been of force, and ſince decayed, by the injury of time, or corruption of men: Secondly, that it is of ſuch *weight*, that *Religion* is like to have more advantage, by reſtoring it, then the *Unity of the Church* ſhall ſuffer, by violating the Regular Authority of the Church. What thanks I ſhall have of my LL. the Biſhops for this, I know not; For I deny,

that

that they themſelves can have any Authority in the Caſe, that ſhall not be confined within the ſame bounds. But it is not poſſible, for him that is the moſt jealous of the Rights of the Crown, in Church-matters, to ſay, what danger there can be to this Crown, in ſecuring the Conſcience of the Kingdom, by the Authority of the Church. For, the acknowledging of thoſe *Bounds*, which the Authority of the Church is confined to, as well in reſpect of *Soveraign Power*, in the Dominions whereof it ſubſiſteth, as of the *reſt of the Church*; leaveth no Plea for it to *Uſurp*, either upon the Crown, or upon the Chriſtian Subjects of it. And all this I claim by S. *Paul*, where he commandeth all Chriſtians, to *abide in that ſtate* in which they are called to be Chriſtians. Which cannot otherwiſe oblige all *Clergie-men*, to be *Subjects*, upon the ſame terms, as they ſhould be, if their Soveraigns were not Chriſtians; but, that it muſt oblige all *Publick Powers*, to maintain the Clergy in the ſame Rights, which they had, and muſt have had over Chriſtian People, did not the Publick Powers profeſs the Faith. And therefore, though I do claim, that the Synods of the two Provinces, and their

their Decrees, ought to be confined within the bounds ſo oft ſaid; yet I do demand of *All*, (eſpecially of thoſe that may have made the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, to their Biſhops) how they can profeſs to owne Epiſcopacy; eſpecially according to their Oath; that paſs over this *Right of the Synods*. For, that which is done *without, or againſt* their Conſent, ſhall make them no Biſhops; That muſt receive Law from their Clergy, if the Secular Power make their ſenſe of the Scripture Law to the Kingdom. Whereas I, that take the liberty to prove all this, *without their Authority*, can clearly Profeſs, that I think it a point not *ſubject to Canonical Authority*, which I plead for; And that otherwiſe, I ſhould think it inconſiſtent with the Oath of Canonical Obedience which I have made.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The Case in which S. Paul *forbears the Weak.*

COme we now to that Scripture of S. *Paul* to the *Romans*, upon which, the whole Plea for *tender Consciences* is grounded, and to *state the Case*, in which he prescribeth. And see, what *forbearance* it will inforce in our Case. S. *Paul*, having shewed the *Romans*; who, before they were converted to be Christians, had been, some Jews, some Gentiles; that Righteousness and Salvation comes only by Faith, or by Christianity, and not by the Law, or by Judaism also; proceedeth in the fourteenth Chapter of that Epistle, to Order them, *to forbear one another*; The Jews not to censure the Gentiles, for not observing the Law; The Gentiles not to scorn the Jews; if, not understanding the freedom of Christians, they lived as Jews, in all or in some things. It is manifest, who are the *strong* and who are the *weak*, with S. *Paul*, in that he is one of the strong, where he says, XV. 1. *We that are*

are ſtrong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. They that underſtand, how Righteouſneſs and Salvation comes only by *Faith*; notwithſtanding that it was to be had under the Law, as well as afore the Law; theſe are the *ſtrong*. *One man believes he may eat any thing*; though forbidden by the Law; *but he that is weak*, and ſees nothing elſe on the Table but that which the Law forbids, *eats herbs*. *One man makes difference of a day above a day*, according to the Law, *another eſteems every day alike*, XIV. 2, 5. Theſe two inſtances are put for all indifferent things, preſcribed or forbidden by the Law. He that underſtood the purpoſe of God in giving the Law, which he intended to make *void*, or rather to *fulfil*, in due time; So that Salvation came not *by it*, when it was to be had *under it*; He is the *ſtrong* with S. *Paul*. He that underſtood it not, and yet continued a Chriſtian, that he might come to underſtand it, *the weak*. Let no man marvel, that the *Romans*, who took S. *Paul* for an Apoſtle, ſhould not underſtand that which S. *Paul* had proved, by this whole Epiſtle. For he proveth it by the *Myſtical ſenſe of the Old Teſtament*; Which, they who had ſubmit-

ted to the Faith could not owne, nevertheleſs, until they underſtood the reaſon, why God gave the Law, with an intent to bring in the Goſpel by it. Let no man think, that they were not fit to be baptized, (for ſuch were they all to whom S. *Paul* writes) that underſtood not this, belonging to the Foundation of Faith. Baptiſm maketh all *Diſciples* of Chriſt, and therefore findeth them not ſo. It is neceſſary, that he who is baptized ſhould undertake all that, which, he ſhall come to learn, that Chriſt hath taught. It is not neceſſary that he ſhould know what it is; knowing that Salvation is not to be had, without doing all that, whatſoever it is, which, it ſhall appear, that Chriſt hath taught.

CHAP. XI.

Compared with his Orders at Corinth, *and elſewhere.*

BUt, ſeeing S. *Paul* forbiddeth the *Corinthians* to *ſcandalize the weak*, in eating meats that had been ſacrificed to Idols; we muſt not ſtate the Caſe of the *Romans*,

Romans, without conſidering, how the Caſe of the *Corinthians* may concern it. Here S. *Paul diſtinguiſhes ſcholaſtically*; that ſuch meats might be eaten, either *as Gods Creatures, materially*, or *formally*, as meats ſacrificed to Idols; which Idolaters feaſted upon, after their Sacrifices, in honour of their Idols; as we ſee by his words, 1 *Cor.* X. 7. *Nor be ye Idolaters, as ſome of them were; As it is written; The people ſate down to eat and drink, and roſe up to play.* And Dan. V. 4. *They drunk wine, and praiſed the Gods of gold and ſilver, of braſs, of iron, of wood and of ſtone.* S. *Paul* then reſolveth, that Chriſtians may eat meats ſacrificed to Idols, as Gods creatures; and that they cannot be polluted, by being ſacrificed to Idols, which are *nothing*. But that, when there may be occaſion for Chriſtians to think, that a Chriſtian eats them as Idolaters did; (as eating them *in an Idol-Temple*, or, *being invited* home *by an Idolater*) in ſuch Caſes, it was neceſſary to forbear, for Chriſtian Charities ſake; leaſt a weak Chriſtian, ſeeing a ſtrong Chriſtian eat them, ſhould think he eat them as Idolaters did; and, doing ſo himſelf, ſhould fall into *miſpriſion of Idolatry*, 1 Cor. VIII. 7, 10. X. 27,

28. And by this example we may gather, by the way, what S. *Paul* means, *Rom.* XIV. 15, 20. *Deſtroy not him with thy meat, for whom Chriſt dyed. For meat deſtroy not the work of God.* He means, that the danger was no leſs, (if the Gentiles ſhould not forbear the Jews, but deſpiſe their weakneſs, that could not ſee themſelves free of the Law) then, that they ſhould fall into diſlike with the Faith, and return to the Jews Religion again. So, the danger at *Corinth* was *Idolatry*; at *Rome Apoſtaſie*. S. *Paul* then, forbids the *Corinthians*, to *make inquiry for conſcience ſake*, 1 Cor. X. 25. whether that which is ſold in the ſhambles had been ſacrificed to an Idol or not. But *Daniel* did make inquiry *for conſcience ſake*, when he reſolved, *not to be polluted with the Kings meat*, Dan. I. 5, 8. taking all of it to be *dedicated* to Idols, in the *firſt-fruits* of it. For this, being the cuſtom of the Heathen, made all their meats ſuſpicious, as dedicated to their Idols. *Tobit* is not *Canonical Scripture*; But it is as Old as the Old Teſtament in Greek. The Author of it relates, for his commendation, that he *kept himſelf from eating the bread of the Gentiles, when his Brethren and kindred*

kindred did eat of it. Tob. I. 10, 11, 12. *becauſe he remembred God with all his heart.* This ſignifies, that the more Religious did obſerve it, though not commanded by the Law. It ſeems they were only forbidden by the Law to go to the feaſts which they, the Gentiles, made of their Sacrifices; leſt they ſhould worſhip their Gods, as they that invited them did, *Exod.* XXXIII. 15. and as they did with the Madianites, *Numb.* XXV. 2. The forbearing of Idolaters meat, was *a hedge to the Law*, that they might be the further off from tranſgreſſing it; But brought in under the *Prophets*, and obſerved by the *more Religious*. And the Jews have reaſon, when they tell us, that, *Nehemiah* was diſpenſed with, *for drinking the wine of the Gentiles, becauſe he was Cup-bearer to the King.* Whereby it appears, that S. *Paul* leaves it to the Charity of every Chriſtian, to uſe his freedom ſo ſparingly, as not to offend a *weak Chriſtian.* But, under the Law, it became a *Rule*, that all the ſtrong ſhould forbear that, which might poſſibly offend the weak. And therefore, when the Apoſtles at *Jeruſalem* injoyn thoſe that were converted of Gentiles, to *abſtain*

from meats ſacrificed to Idols; they do forbid them to eat ſuch meats, even *materially*: And command them to make *inquiry for conſcience ſake*, as the Jews uſed to do, and as converted Gentiles did in the Land of Promiſe. For the Ordinance of *Acts* XV. 23. addreſſeth only to the Churches of *Judæa*, and to thoſe, which *Paul* and *Barnabas*, being ſent from *Antiochia*, had founded in *Cilicia*, and the parts adjacent, *Acts* XIII. 2, 3, 14--XIV. 26. XV. XVI. 4. The reaſon of this difference is manifeſt, by the words of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* XII. 2. *Ye know ye were Gentiles, carried after theſe dumb Idols, as ye were led.* Whereas *Paul* and *Barnabas* addreſſed firſt to the Jews, and founded Churches of them, for the greateſt part. So that, the hopes of winning the Jews remaining, the *diſpenſation* was to take place. But the Church of *Rome* conſiſted of Gentiles, as well as of Jews; whereas, in the Church of *Corinth*, there is no account at all had of the Jews. And therefore, the forbearance required at *Corinth* is out of fear of *Idolatry*; at *Rome*, of *Apoſtaſie*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

The preſent Caſe of this time ſtated.

HAving thus ſtated the Caſe, in which S. *Paul* ordereth this forbearance, let us ſtate our Caſe, in which it is demanded, by conſequence. But that cannot be done, but out of the premiſes. We muſt ſuppoſe, the Church of *England*, a member of the *whole Church*, deſires to Reform it ſelf, becauſe the reſt of the Church will not joyn in the ſame work; But deſires to continue a member of the whole Church, and not to give any cauſe of interrupting Unity, by improving Chriſtianity. I know, ſome of them that demand *Toleration* do not allow *any ſuch thing, as a Church of England*, when they are underſtood. For, how ſhould they owne any Right of Soveraign Powers, to give Law to the Church of their Dominions, that allow them no Right, to puniſh the tranſgreſſion of ſuch Laws? But the Caſe muſt be ſtated upon the Terms propoſed, nevertheleſs, as to thoſe that acknowledge National Churches;

Excepting for thoſe that make this Plea, when we ſee time. This only, I think, would be ſaid, that the Church of *England* is not now to be Reformed; but, having been Reformed, is now queſtioned, as if the Reformation of it were not yet perfect; And therefore the boldneſs is taken, by a private perſon of my condition, to give an Opinion, what is moſt wanting in the Reformation of it. Becauſe it cannot be ſaid, what is unduely demanded, until it may be ſaid, what is due to be done. But it muſt be remembred, that the demand is made in behalf of thoſe, that had made a *Schiſm* in the Church of *England*, by *Ordaining or being Ordained* Presbyters by Presbyters, without and againſt the will of their Biſhops. In behalf of thoſe it hath been demanded, that their Ordinations may ſtand valid and good, and the perſons inabled, by the Law of the Land, to miniſter the Offices of their Orders, and to be truſted with the Cure of Souls, by their Biſhops. And not only ſo, but it hath been further demanded, that ſome of thoſe Laws, by which Religion is ſetled in the Kingdom, be repealed, for their ſakes; That they may have no pretenſe to ſcruple the Office

of

of the Miniſtry. Not that it is now ſaid, (as for this hundred years it hath been ſaid) that the Laws which they would have repealed are againſt Gods Law; And that therefore they cannot yield them obedience. But that the *Miniſters*, or *People* that will follow them, have a doubt in Conſcience, which they cannot be cleared of, that it is not *Lawful* for them to yield them obedience; and that they cannot do it without ſinning, and incurring damnation, by doing againſt their Conſciences. And this is alſo the Caſe, in which, thoſe that acknowledge *no Church of England*, no Right in Chriſtian Powers, to give Law to the Church within their own Dominions, do demand liberty to ſeparate from the Church, into their private Conventicles. Proteſting, that they cannot hold Communion with the Church ſetled by the Laws of the Land; No not though Reformed to the content of thoſe hitherto mentioned. And pretending the ſame reaſon from S. *Paul*, that they ſhould incur ſin and damnation, doing it in that doubt, which they cannot be cleared of.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

The Miſtake which cauſeth Weakneſs *in our Caſe.*

THe Caſe thus ſtated, I muſt, in the firſt place, aſk both Parties, whether they do think in their Conſciences, that S. *Paul* had not ſhewed the Jews at *Rome*, that were become Chriſtians, ſufficient reaſon, to clear them of the doubts they had, concerning their obligation to the Law of *Moſes*; that they were indeed free of it, and ought to be free of thoſe doubts. I ſuppoſe they will think it fit to ſay, that, though S. *Paul* injoyn them to *forbear* one another, ſo long as they did not underſtand their freedom; yet, that they might underſtand it, and were bound to underſtand it. For, is there any man ſo little a Chriſtian; now that the time of *forbearance* is paſt, that there is no more hope to gain the Jews, by compliance, without making our ſelves Jews; as to make a queſtion of offending a Jew, by not abating the Profeſſion of his Chriſtianity? The conſequence whereof

whereof is all that I demand. If S. *Paul* would have the Jews forborn, that the provocation, which they might meet with, might not move them to diſlike their Chriſtianity; certainly he held them to be under a light, which obliged them not to diſlike it. Otherwiſe he ſhould not have done the work which he pretends to do by this Epiſtle; to ſhew the Law to be void, becauſe Salvation comes *only by Faith.* And certainly, there can be nothing more opprobrious to Chriſtianity, then that which is pleaded, for abatement in the preſent Laws; That the weak are not under a light, inabling them to ſee thoſe things to be lawful, which indeed, and to the ſtrong, may be lawful, and appear ſuch. For how could this doubt be cleared, if a weak Conſcience ſhould be pretended, when the queſtion is, whether to turn Chriſtian or not? Is it poſſible, that there ſhould be ſuch a doubt in that point, that a man, to whom the Reaſon why he ought to be a Chriſtian is *ſufficiently propoſed*, can be ſaid to be under a light, that convinceth him not? Which if it be true, then is there nothing in Chriſtianity, which there is not a ſufficient light, to convict that man of,

of, to whoſe *Office* it belongs. Otherwiſe, it could not belong to his *Office*; not being able to diſcern the *Obligation* of it. It is therefore a horrible reproach to Chriſtianity, to ſay, that any *doubting Conſcience* is not under a light, ſufficient to reſolve it. *Scruples* of Conſcience there may be, which may eternally have recourſe; and that no diſparagement to the Faith; Becauſe the Faith provides a Reſolution, that they who have ſcruples in Conſcience, are bound in Conſcience to lay them aſide; Nay to act poſitively againſt them. But he that ſays, that, being a Chriſtian, he is not under a light ſufficient to clear him, in any *doubt* of Conſcience, ſays, that the Faith obligeth him to ſin; Whereas it is not the Faith, but the want of it, which, obligeth not the erring Conſcience to ſin, but intangleth him ſo, that he muſt ſin, if the *obligation of acting* fall out before the errour be removed. Suppoſe the Jews convict by the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, that Salvation comes only by Faith, and not by the Law alſo; And you ſuppoſe them under a light, that, neither the Law, nor any Ordinance, then ſtanding by virtue of the Law, could oblige. But, ſuppoſe them

in

in love with themſelves, and with their *Anceſtors*, and to have ſuch an Opinion of Salvation *intailed upon them and their iſſue*, by the Law, as to think, that they could not have it by God that gave the Law, if the Gentiles might have it as well as themſelves; and they might (*very well*, for conſequence of Reaſon, though *very ill*, for their own account) overſee the light they were under. Suppoſe we now, thoſe that make this Plea, not to believe *one Catholick Church*, and *one Baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſins*; But had rather *gratifie the Socinians*, and deny, that any Chriſtian can be obliged, to any thing that appears not to his *own Reaſon*, *out of Canonical Scripture*; Then imagine he ſhould *gratifie the Papiſt*, if he ſhould grant, that Catholick Communion always made the Catholick Church; Suppoſe them not to believe, that the Faith which only ſaveth includeth Baptiſm in the Catholick Church; And that this Church is not *Reformed*, unleſs it be reſtored to the ſame form; I ſay ſuppoſing them poſſeſt with ſuch prejudices as theſe, and marvel not, to ſee them *eternally doubting*, whether or no, it be lawful for them, to obey the Laws, which this Church and Kingdom is

able

able to make. Nay, to ſee them break out into *Schiſm*, as all Parties now ſeem to do, rather then obey them, when they ſhall be out of hope, to give their own Law to the Kingdom; Never forecaſting, how it may appear to continue a Church, when they have given ſuch Laws to it.

CHAP. XIV.

That it is not Forbearance *to allow their Orders.*

I Suppoſe, they who make this Plea, will not grant, that they are in any errour ſo *near the Foundation*, as theſe which I name. Nor do I think, that thoſe Chriſtian Jews at *Rome*, that doubted of tranſgreſſing the Law, when they knew that Salvation comes only by Faith, did *deny the Foundation of Faith.* For, as long as they lived in the Church, they were in the way to learn, and underſtand, how both were true. Neither will I ſay, that any of thoſe, who deſire *Forbearance* for the *weak*, are in any errour deſtructive to the Foundation of Faith, and the hope of Salvation,

vation, till they break out into Conventicles. When that is done, I am thenceforth bound to charge them with all the Error, which the *Title of their Schism* can ſignifie. And therefore I charge them with *Hypocriſie*, when they pretend to *Forbearance* becauſe they are *weak*, and yet break out into Conventicles. When they do ſo, then they can be counted no more the *weak* among Chriſtians, then thoſe Jews which S. *Paul* will have to be forborn, as the weak among Chriſtians; ſuppoſing them to have renounced the Faith afterwards, rather then continue in the Church. And therefore, the Plea of *weak* Conſciences cannot be allowed thoſe that ingage in Conventicles. They have cut themſelves off from it, by leaving the Church; Let them return, and then make the beſt of it. As to them, the Church is under a new Precept of S. *Paul*, which ſays; *A man that is an Heretick, after the firſt and ſecond admonition avoid. Knowing that ſuch a one is out of the way, and ſinneth, being condemned by himſelf*, Titus III. 10, 11. Becauſe, ſaith S. *Hierom*, after S. *Cyprian*; Whereas other ſinners are put out of the Church, by thoſe that manage the Keys of the Church;

Church; Hereticks and Schiſmaticks put themſelves out of the Church. Therefore *Titus*; that is, all *Titus* his flock; are to *avoid* them for Excommunicate perſons, who do *Excommunicate themſelves*. As for thoſe that continue in the Church; though with a pretenſe of giving ſuch Laws to the Church, as no man knows how ſoon they may unchurch it; let them make their beſt of it. But being grounded, at leaſt upon a pretenſe of *weakneſs*, there can be no queſtion made, but ſome errour muſt be granted, for the *ground of this weakneſs*. Let themſelves, at their leiſure, aſſign what errour they will acknowledge, if they like not that which I have aſſigned. Only let them ſhew the world; that is, the Legiſlative Power of this Kingdom; what errour it is, that they have hitherto had, which being avoided for the future, all thoſe difficulties will ceaſe, which, this Diſcourſe pretendeth, cannot be met with, but by bounding the Reformation within the Faith and the Laws of the Catholick Church. In the mean time, let me go on to ſhew, that thoſe who were Ordained in and for the late Schiſm, (compoſed by the Laws, at his Majeſties Return) by Preſby-

Preſbyters againſt their Biſhops, cannot claim by virtue of it, to be owned for Preſbyters; Or, in the terms of the Ancient Church, to be *received in their own Orders.* A thing which there can no queſtion be made in, by any body that underſtands, what the Church, or what a Schiſm ſignifies. And it is marvel, how, they that would be thought to allow Epiſcopacy ſhould queſtion it. To acknowledge the *Authority of giving Orders in the Biſhops*, according to the Laws, by which we both maintain this Church to be Reformed; and yet to allow thoſe that are made Preſbyters by thoſe Biſhops, (not to Ordain others, but to Miniſter the Office of their Order, according to the Reformation ſetled in this Church) I ſay, to allow them to Ordain others, to Miniſter their Office by other Laws, not only without, but againſt the conſent of the Biſhops, from whom they have their Orders, is nothing elſe but to imagine, that God hath given Power to divide (that is, to deſtroy) his Church. For what is *ſetting up Altar againſt Altar*, but to Uſurp Power to Conſecrate the Euchariſt, and give the Communion of it, in deſpite of them, whom they allow to have Power to

do the ſame; becauſe they do it by Authority received from themſelves? In all the Records of the Church, there is but one Caſe expreſly remembred, in which it can be ſaid to have been done. That fell out in *Ægypt*, at the time when the Church was divided, between the Arians and the Catholicks. But before that trouble, there was another diviſion on foot, about receiving back into the Church, thoſe that had fallen from the Faith, in the perſecution of *Diocletian*. For *Meletius*, Biſhop of *Lycopolis*, had proceeded to Ordain Biſhops, in as many Cities as he could, in oppoſition to thoſe Biſhops, that ſtuck to the See of *Alexandria*. In theſe diſtractions, *Coluthus, one of the XII Presbyters of Alexandria*, became the Head of a Party by himſelf; and to propagate his Party, took upon him to make Ordinations of Preſbyters, to Miniſter to thoſe of his Sect. *Aerius* is the man, that maintained the Authority of Biſhops and Preſbyters to be all one. Yet do I not remember, that it is any where ſaid, that *Aerius* took upon him to *Ordain Presbyters*, being himſelf one. Much leſs, that he was able to hold up a Sect, by ſuch Ordinations. *Audius* was a Preſbyter, that became the Father

ther of one of those Sects, that *Epiphanius* writes against. But *Epiphanius* says expressly, that he had Bishops that imbraced his *Opinion*, and propagated his Sect by Ordination. *Tertullian* became the Father of a Sect, which continued at *Carthage*, till S. *Austines* time; by whom they were reduced to the Church. And truly it is to be presumed, that the Father of the Sect did propagate it, by Ordinations made *of his own Head.* For what should he stick at, that takes upon him to divide the Church, and to *set up Altar against Altar?* But I have not found it said, that he did do it. Nor have I found, that any Presbyter did ever undertake to do it, but *Coluthus.* At the Council of *Nicæa*, to unite the *Meletians* to the Church, the Bishops Ordained by him were allowed to succeed, when the present Bishops should dye; yet so, as to be then lawfully Ordained, though they had been Schismatically Ordained afore. But when the *Coluthians* pretended the same priviledge, *Athanasius* pleads for himself, that all *Coluthus* his Ordinations were made void. Which is thought to have been done, by that Synod at *Alexandria*, which *Hosius* was present at, with

Commiſſion from *Conſtantine*. This is the *only Example* of Preſbyters Ordained by a Preſbyter, without and againſt his Biſhop. All the reſt are meer conjectures, which cannot ſtand, unleſs we ſuppoſe, the Canons of the Church were not obſerved, becauſe it is not recorded how they were obſerved. Whereas all reaſon requires us to ſuppoſe, that they were obſerved, becauſe they might be obſerved; and becauſe there followed no diſſenſion, upon their not being obſerved. Such Ordinations then, being meer *nullities*, as preſumed to be done by them, that never received Authority from the Church to Ordain; do further induce *Irregularity*, by the Canons of the Church. And who can deny, that all reaſon and Conſcience requires it? For, who can believe his Creed, profeſſing one Catholick Church, and not think the Church more diſobliged *by Schiſm*, then by any other Crime, that renders a man *uncapable* to be promoted to Orders? Certainly, if Rebellion be the Crime, that is hardeſt to be reconciled to Civil truſt, then is Schiſm hardeſt to be reconciled to truſt in the Church. Nevertheleſs, becauſe Unity is to be preferred before Diſcipline;

pline; and becauſe experience ſhews, that, when men are taken off from an ingagement in diviſion, they prove the more truſty, the more weary they were of their ingagement; it hath been often practiſed by the Church, to *receive*, not only *Schiſmaticks*, but even *Hereticks* alſo, (That is, ſuch as had received Orders of thoſe, that parted from the Church, upon an errour in Faith) *in their* reſpective *Orders*. But always upon condition of renouncing the cauſe of their diviſion; Whereupon they were to receive the *Bleſſing of the Church*, by *Prayer with Impoſition of Hands*. The reaſon was, becauſe neither is Baptiſm in Schiſm effectual to Salvation, nor Ordination in Schiſm effectual to Grace, by the Miniſtry of any Office in Schiſm. But, being renounced, there remains no Cauſe, why their Miniſtry ſhould not be effectual to their people; Their Baptiſm and their Miniſtry to their own Salvation; ſuppoſing it ſincerely renounced. Therefore the Reaſon, why they who are Ordained by Preſbyters cannot be received in their reſpective Orders, is peremptory; Becauſe, the *Schiſm*, conſiſting in Ordaining againſt Authority, cannot be renoun-

ced, unleſs the Ordination be voided. For, ſo long as the *Miniſtry may be uſurped, upon ſuch Ordination*, ſo long is the Schiſm on foot. I do very well know, that the Ordinations of Arians were allowed by S. *Athanaſius*, in a Synod at *Alexandria*; who had made the Ordination of *Iſchyras* by *Coluthus* void. And I remember the high acclamation, which S. *Hierom* applauds his Act with; That thereby, *the world was ſnatched out of Satans jaws.* But I read, that the Tertullinialts were received into the Church; not that they were *received in their Orders.* I find difficulty made by Forreign Churches, of *receiving the Donatiſts in their Orders*; Notwithſtanding the complaints of the African Biſhops, that, without them, they had not Clergy enough to ſerve the Church. Hereby it is to be judged, how ſevere this Church was, with them that had received Ordination by Preſbyters. The Canon of the whole Church makes all *Irregular*; Ordainers and Ordained. Becauſe they had concurred to bring back his Majeſty; (Which was the reſtoring of the Laws, and ſo of the Church) the forfeiture was wholly paſſed by, and nothing required of

of Ordainers, more then of the Clergy; Which is an utter *Oblivion* of the attempt made by those Ordinations. And is not that a very great degree of *Forbearance* in our Case? S. *Paul*, when he injoyns *Forbearance*, doth he injoyn, that those who did not understand, how men were saved by Faith alone, that were saved under the Law, should be promoted to Orders, indifferently with those that did profess it? That were indeed something like that which hath been demanded, that *Weakness* should intitle to the Clergy; which orderly supposes *strength*. But does he injoyn farther, that they should Minister without Orders? That, *continuing Lay-men*, they should commit the Sacrilege of Usurping to Celebrate the Eucharist? That, if their Ordination be void, by the Law of the Land, there should be a new Law made, to make their Ordination good and valid, which was void when it was made? Then must he injoyn, that it be lawful for every Lay-man to celebrate the Eucharist; Forasmuch as every Lay-man hath as much to do, to celebrate the Eucharist, as he whose Ordination is void. Surely S. *Paul*, that commands Christians to be *without*

offenſe to the Jews and Gentiles, as well as to the Church, commands them alſo to be without offenſe to *Papiſts*. And will not we have thoſe, that would be inabled to conſecrate the Euchariſt, by ſuch a Law, to ſhew us how to ſatisfie the Papiſts, that ſuch Orders are good? At leaſt thoſe, that by their ſufferings have preſerved Ordination by Biſhops; Let them at leaſt be ſatisfied of the Validity of Ordination without Biſhops. At leaſt, let no man impoſe upon them, that they cannot yield the *Forbearance*, which S. *Paul* requires for tender Conſciences, unleſs they receive the Sacrament *conſecrated by Laymen*; That is, by thoſe, whoſe Ordination they believe to be utterly void.

CHAP. XV.

That the Orders of the Reformed Churches are not void, becauſe theſe are.

NOw I am to look an Objection in the face, which, at a diſtance ſeems to admit of no Anſwer; but, if it be a little conſidered, will appear, to have neither Reaſon nor Religion at the bottom of it.

It

It is ſaid, that hereby, we ſhall make void the Ordinations of the Reformed Churches of *France*, and others Reformed according to *Calvin*; And ſo, make them no Churches. Here we agree, that it was neceſſary for the French, as well as for our ſelves, to Reform themſelves; That it was neceſſary for all to Reform themſelves, unto the Form of the Primitive Catholick Church, I ſay not we do agree; I ſay, that, till we do agree, there remains no hope of Unity, becauſe no Rule for Reformation, in the Church. But to the Objection; Who hath the Conſcience to think, or the Face to ſay, that, if Ordinations made by Preſbyters againſt their Biſhops be void; Then, Ordinations made by Preſbyters, where they could not be had by Biſhops, are void? For, that is the *difference of the Caſes.* It is manifeſt, that the Biſhops of this Church, when they Ordain Preſbyters, Ordain them to Miniſter their Office, according to the Laws; That is, under their Biſhops. And can any man imagine, that hereby, they give them Power to Ordain others to Miniſter their Office, by what Laws they pleaſe themſelves? And, had the French demanded of their

Biſhops,

Biſhops, to Ordain them Preſbyters, that ſhould Miniſter their Office, according to the Reformation, does any man think they would have done it? So, the *neceſſity* of Reforming, which we all agree in, made the Ordinations of the Reformed Churches; The *Pride and Preſumption*, which cauſeth all Hereſie and Schiſm, uſurping Authority never received, made the Ordinations of our Preſbyters. And ſhall they be as valid as thoſe? All that can be queſtioned is, how it may appear, that it was not of choice, but of neceſſity, that they imbraced that way, of ſetling and propagating their Reformation, which they imbraced. And for that, we have ſufficient *Preſumption*, from the *Albigenſes*; Who ſecretly Reforming themſelves, under the See of *Rome*, did certainly do it, by the Authority of Biſhops, who propagated their Order by Ordinations. This may be proved by other teſtimonies, if need be; But it is ſufficient, that the Caſe of the Bohemians is ſo well known. They, having reſolved, exactly to Reform themſelves; and having choſen the Perſons, whom they would have for their *Biſhops*; were at a ſtand, how to compaſs their ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles,

ſtles, by having them Ordained by Biſhops. In this *nonplus*, they underſtood, that there were in *Auſtria*, of the *Albigenſes*, that kept ſecret Communion among themſelves, under their Biſhops; notwithſtanding that publickly, to avoid the Laws, they went to Maſs. To them they ſent their Biſhops elect, proteſting againſt their diſſembling; but deſiring Ordination for their Biſhops, which thus were propagated. And this may well ſeem to be the Reaſon, why, they that Reformed in the Empire, according to *Luther*, (in the name of whom *Melanct hon* hath offered, to be ſubject to their own Biſhops, admitting the Reformation) ſet up ſuch a Form of Epiſcopacy, as they could, of themſelves. For, they had cauſe to think, that the Bohemians had not advantaged themſelves enough, by that Ordination, which they had been able to procure. For, it is to be noted, that they, the Bohemians, had ſent all over the World, to learn, how to get ſuch Ordination, as might authorize their Miniſtry, according to the Reformation which they pretended. And are not we, hereupon, to preſume, that the French, by theſe degrees, finding a neceſſity of balking

ing the Authority of the Epiſcopacy, which they were under, did think themſelves, thereupon, free, to caſt themſelves into that Form, which they uſe? For, if it be ſaid; That, by this time, they had profited beyond their Predeceſſors, in diſcovering the *Whore of Babylon*; that they found Epiſcopacy to be the *Body of Antichriſt*, and therefore renounced it; It will appear, by many Reaſons, that this cannot ſerve the turn. Firſt, how can the common ſenſe of men endure to believe, that the Pope is Antichriſt, by reaſon of that Greatneſs, which, it is certain and evident, that he hath attained, by Uſurping the Rights of his inferiour Biſhops? And yet, thoſe inferiour Biſhops be the Body of Antichriſt; by ſuffering thoſe Uſurpations, which they cannot help? Secondly, it is manifeſt, that they who ſhould hold this Plea could not pretend, by virtue of their Orders, received from the Biſhops of this Church, to Ordain Preſbyters; Unleſs they would ſay, that they may have their *Authority from Antichriſt*. This Plea, therefore, muſt remain for the *Independents*; to authorize them, (that think themſelves in the State of Grace, before they are members of

of the Church) to make their Congregations Churches, and Uſurp the *Authority of Apoſtles*, in Ordaining their own Miniſters. Laſtly, it appeareth ſufficiently, that very many learned and religious perſons, of thoſe Churches, have not only approved the Epiſcopacy here ſetled; But have wiſhed the benefit of it, to themſelves. Whereby it is manifeſt, that thoſe Churches cannot owne this Reaſon; when another, ſo far from it, is owned by their principal Members. I have another Reaſon to alledge, which weighs as much with me as all theſe; And, that is, the Communion, which hath always been uſed, between this Church, and the Reformed Churches. For, ſhould they hold *Communion* with us, and yet think our Ordinations *authorized by Antichriſt*, how could they expect to be believed, ſo groſly contradicting themſelves? And therefore, though I muſt not take upon me, either to *juſtifie*, or to *condemn* their Ordinations; Averring on one ſide, that they are not according to Rule; Seeing on the other ſide, that they are owned by my Superiors; yet I muſt acknowledge, that there are very great Reaſons to hope, and to preſume, that

that God accepteth of their Ordinations, though not made according to Rule; In consideration of the necessity that drove them to it, and of the Reformation, which they were used to propagate. Whereas, those that *Usurp the Power of the Keys*, and the *Consecrating of the Eucharist*, by virtue of Ordinations made in despite of those Bishops, from whom they have all the Authority, which they can challenge by their Orders; what pretense is there to imagine, that there can be any such *Crime as Schism*, if this be not it? That God should bless that, which is done by such gross *Usurpation*, as this is? And when all this is said, it remains free for me to say, That there is no other way to restore, and to preserve *Unity within the Reformation*, but by establishing and maintaining Episcopacy, in that Authority, which it hath always had, for the determining of differences; Nor maintain that Authority, but by confining it, within the Bounds, which the Faith and the Laws of the whole Church do limit. As for the Fanaticks, which make our Orders void, because the *Pope is Antichrist, and the Mass Idolatry*, whence our Bishops received, and where they exercised

erciſed their Orders; I will only conſider the Caſe of the *Donatiſts*, *forejudged by the whole Church.* They pleaded, in point of fact, that *Cæcilianus* was Ordained by *Apoſtates.* A thing which the Church was ſo clear in, that the African Biſhops offered to give up their Sees, if it were proved. But beſides, *in point of Right*, had it been proved, and *Cæcilianus* owned by the Church, becauſe it did not appear, or becauſe they thought the Canons ought to be diſpenſed with, for Unities ſake; thoſe that Ordained *Cæcilianus* having repented of their Apoſtacy; ſhall we imagine, that the Church was loſt, by owning thoſe that *had been Apoſtates*, and their Ordinations? The Donatiſts are branded for Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, maintaining all the Laws of the Church, but that of Unity. And ſhall *Lay-Chriſtians*, preſuming to *authorize Lay-Chriſtians*, to conſecrate the Euchariſt, and ſet up Churches, be eſteemed leſs then Hereticks and Schiſmaticks? Let thoſe that pretend to Unity find that Forbearance, which a favourable conſtruction of their actions ſignifies. But Charity to the ſound obligeth, to take the profeſſion of Schiſmaticks in the worſt ſenſe, which

if

if we do, the making of Independent Congregations Churches will be the *denying of One Catholick* Church; and the making of them Hereticks that do it.

CHAP. XVI.

That changing the Laws for the Weak *is not* Forbearance.

BUt if it be a thing abſurd in common ſenſe, to allow them their Orders, much more abſurd will it be, to change the Eccleſiaſtical Laws of the Land for their ſakes; Which is nothing elſe, but to purchaſe their Miniſtry, at the price of our Religion; which the Eccleſiaſtical Laws contain. Here, we muſt diſtinguiſh two queſtions; For it may be lawful for Chriſtian people, to live by thoſe Laws, which it was not lawful for Superiors, in Church and State, to make. A thing evident to all that believe, that it was poſſible for our Anceſtors, before the Reformation, to be ſaved, under the abuſes of the Church of *Rome*. But our queſtion is, whether or no, the Laws of Superiors injoyn that, which Gods Law forbids Inferiors

Inferiors to do. Otherwiſe, it is pernicious to *all Government*, that Inferiors ſhould take upon them, to judge the Acts of Superiors. But if the matter of the Law be within the Power that makes it, to require an *Exception* for *tender Conſciences* is to ſay, that there is *no Power in the World* to give any Law to thoſe tender Conſciences. Was there ever any Hereſie, any Schiſm, any Religion pretending Chriſtianity, that did not alledge Scripture for themſelves? Did ever any man alledge it, that would not be thought, to be touched at the heart with it? What is there for a Chriſtian to doubt at, where *the Exception of tender Conſciences* lyes not? Or how ſhall we, that agree againſt the See of *Rome*, but agree not in the terms and grounds of Reformation, be tryed, in the ſenſe of the Scripture? Can any man imagine, that S. *Paul* intended to deſtroy his own Authority, of giving Law to the Church, which he exerciſed, when he ordered the Jews and Gentiles at *Rome*, to *forbear* one another? Or is this Authority dead with the Apoſtles? What Church then can there be alive, if there be no Authority derived from the Apoſtles, to give Law to it? But the Au-

thority is not queſtioned, ſo it *provide for weak Conſciences*. Epiſcopacy will be owned, if the Secular Power will force it, to take them for their Preſbyters, whoſe Miniſtry they cannot give account to God of; Being both authorized and exerciſed by Laws made, without and againſt their Authority. This, no Chriſtianity can juſtifie. Chriſtianity maintains the Eſtates of the World, in all the Right they had, when they became Chriſtians; And cannot juſtifie it ſelf to the World otherwiſe. How ſhould the World receive it upon other terms? But if the World ſtand upon the ſame terms, having received Chriſtianity, as afore; then muſt Chriſtianity, and the Church, continue in the ſame Rights, which it had before the World received it. No exception to be allowed, but as afore; If it appear, that the Faith and Laws of the Primitive Church be decayed. Not if it ſeem to *private Spirits*, that the Scripture is not fulfilled. In the mean time, is it for the honour of the Religion we profeſs, that *Weakneſs*, (which at the beſt is *negative ignorance*, in truth, perhaps, *wilful ignorance*) ſhould give Law to it? Is it reaſon, that they, who have failed to

deſtroy

deſtroy both Church and Kingdom, ſhould give Law to both? As if a Child ſhould govern the Houſe, becauſe he will be ſtamfold, and diſquieted, otherwiſe. Surely it is that, which the Emperor ſaid to his Niece; *Putas tibi injuriam fieri niſi imperas?* But is that the way to have Peace in Religion? When Inferiors ſhall be made to *tread upon the necks* of their Superiors, they will be ſo modeſt for the future, as to ſtay there. They will be content, to have their Doctrine regulated by them, as the Law of the Kingdom requires. Or, they will think fit, that the Biſhops be content with their Revenues, and leave them to *Preach what they pleaſe.* Surely, they that can carry the diſpute of a hundred years; wherein the Biſhops had ſo viſibly the better, that Club-law was found requiſite to get the advantage; will not lay down the Cudgels here. So, they that agree, in conforming to the Laws, differing every day, in that which the Law determines not, the *Recuſants* on both ſides may make hay in the heat of our Contentions; and profit more by ſuch a Law, then by the War which deſtroyed this Church. But eſpecially the *Atheiſts*, who have profited ſo well under

theſe Contentions, as to make that viſible, which was but foreſeen under the Uſurper; That no Religion would in time ſtand to be the Religion of the Kingdom; They, having the Priviledge of the Laws, and not liable to any Infamy, when the differences maintained make Religion contemptible, ſhall have cauſe to thank all that ſhall have done their work, by ſolliciting ſuch Laws.

CHAP. XVII.

Of the Opinion of Regeneration by Baptiſm.

ONe point I muſt not paſs over in ſilence, which hath been named for a point to be changed; That all paſſages, ſeeming to determine *the Opinion of Baptiſmal Regeneration*, be altered in the Liturgy and Rubricks of it. For, this point is an inſtance, how eaſily, the ſubſtance of Faith, neceſſary to Salvation, may be queſtioned, or abated, or renounced, by a Clauſe of ſuch an Act. I grant it is clearly S. *Pauls Opinion*, S. *Peters Opinion*, *our Lord Chriſts Opinion*, the Opinion of Gods whole Church. Be it the Opinion of thoſe,

thoſe, whoſe Opinion is our Faith. But he that would have it no more then Opinion, muſt teach us a new Faith. No *Remiſſion of Sins* but by Baptiſm; Entring us into the *Covenant* of Grace, which the Vow of Baptiſm inacteth. Entring us into the *Church*, into which the Sacrament of Baptiſm introduceth. Abate the Covenant, which the Sacrament of Baptiſm inacteth, and how ſhall a Chriſtian be regenerate? Abate the mention of it in the Service, and where will be the Faith, which this Church, with the Whole Church, hitherto profeſſeth? Shew me any Chriſtian, that ever queſtioned it, till it was queſtioned, what was to be Reformed in the Church, and let it be abated. Could *Pelagius* have queſtioned it, his Hereſie had not ſo eaſily been quelled. He that travelled all the Church, from *Britain* to *Jeruſalem*, had he found *any Church, any received Doctor of any Church*, that durſt maintain Salvation due by the Covenant of Grace, to any man that dyes unbaptized, he had made the Church more work then he did. No Baptiſm, no Original ſin; no Cure for Original ſin but Baptiſm; no Salvation without the Cure. They that think to

confute Anabaptiſts, abating this point of Faith, no marvel if they make Anabaptiſts; when they make men think, that the Church hath no better Reaſon to confute them with, then they will uſe. Some perhaps, that are not ſo well taught as they ſhould be, may think it unagreeable with Chriſtianity, that Salvation ſhould depend upon a *Bodily act*, as the waſhing of Baptiſm; and that *in the Power*, not of him that is Baptized, but *of the Church*, or of him that is to miniſter in behalf of the Church. But S. *Peter* hath anſwered this Objection, by diſtinguiſhing two things in Baptiſm, 1 *Pet.* III. 21. the one, the *waſhing of the Body*, which ſaves not; The other, the Anſwer that is made out *of a good Conſcience*, to the *Examination* tendered him that is Baptized; whether he will undertake Chriſtianity or not; And this *ſaves*, if S. *Peter* ſay true. And what account can any Chriſtian give himſelf, to ground the hope of his Salvation upon, but his Chriſtianity; which the Goſpel tendreth, which Baptiſm inacteth? Or what can be neceſſary to Salvation, if the ground of the hope thereof be not? This is that one ground, which overthroweth both thoſe Hereſies, in which,

I ſaid,

I ſaid, all the erroneous Doctrines, of that Confuſion which we have ſeen, do reſolve. The Profeſſion, which we make at our Baptiſm, is the Condition on our part, upon which, the Promiſe of the Covenant of Grace becomes due on Gods part. The Profeſſion ſo made, nothing can defeat the hope of a Chriſtian, but the tranſgreſſing of it; Being tranſgreſſed, nothing can repair this hope, but the reſtoring of it. All Arts to diſguiſe this Faith, all over the Scripture, ſignifie nothing, but the hope of Salvation, without living the life of Chriſtians. I will hope, whatſoever *Fanaticks* or *Atheiſts* would have, that there was never any intent to demand, ſo great *an Apoſtaſie from the Faith* to be inacted, by a Law of the Kingdom. I will hope much more, that, had it been demanded, it would have been rejected, with that indignation, which ſo great Apoſtaſie deſerveth. But I am glad, and give God hearty thanks, that I have lived to the day, when I may and do teſtifie to my Country, and to the Church of God in it, that he who ſhould demand of them, to renounce this point, muſt demand of them to unchurch themſelves, and to be, for the future, that which the

See of *Rome* would have us to be.

CHAP. XVIII.

Conference for Satisfaction is Forbearance.

BUt is there then no effect of S. *Pauls* precept, in our Case? Can we break the Unity of the Church, without breaking the Charity of Christians? Or can particular Christians be tyed *to forbear one another*, and Christian Powers not be tied, to cause both to do the same? Here is indeed the *Hinge*, upon which the truth turns; and resolves all questions, and clears all difficulties, which must and will intangle the World in confusion, upon the account of Christianity, till it be owned. Christian Powers may constrain their Subjects, that profess Christianity, to be Christians; and punish them if they be not. But they must protect them for their Subjects, though they be not. The reason of this hath not been declared, by the Reformation; though they have just cause to complain, and do, as they have cause, complain of the See of *Rome*, for authorizing *capital Penalties* upon Hereticks.

ticks. Under that name they comprize alſo *Schiſmaticks*; And Schiſmaticks, in their language, (as alſo in the language of all that claim the Authority of the Church) ſignifies all that maintain Communion apart; though the *Cauſe make the Crime* before God. But if S. *Paul* have Reaſon, when he commands every Chriſtian to *continue in the Eſtate in which he was called* to be a Chriſtian, then can no mans Life or Eſtate become forfeit, for not being a Chriſtian; And much leſs, for not being *Orthodox*, but an *Heretick*. If the Life or Eſtates of Subjects ſhould Eſchete to the Soveraign, for not being Chriſtians, that *temporal Dominion* of Soveraigns muſt be *founded upon the Grace* they have to be Chriſtians. All ſuch Right S. *Paul* diſclaims, and diſcharges. But ſhall Soveraign Power, that is Chriſtian, be therefore diſabled, to give Law to Subjects profeſſing Chriſtianity? That is our Caſe; the whole Kingdom profeſſing Chriſtianity, though the *Whole* cannot ſo properly be ſaid to profeſs the Reformation. For, the Reformation ſetled by Law, we ſee, is refuſed, as well by thoſe that ſeparate from it, for a Reformation of their own, as by thoſe that

adhere

adhere to the See of *Rome*. Shall the Soveraign then loſe the Right, that all Chriſtian Soveraigns have, of giving Law to their Subjects, in point of Religion, becauſe he is a Chriſtian? Or ſhall the Subject, by being a Chriſtian, ſtand obliged to the Laws of his Soveraign, commanding him to ſtand to the Chriſtianity which he profeſſeth? Suppoſe the Chriſtianity commanded to be *Viſible*, before Chriſtian Powers command it, and you inable their Laws to oblige their Subjects. Not ſuppoſing it, you cannot ſay, how the Laws of Soveraign Powers ſhould oblige Chriſtian Subjects; ſeeing the Papacy, as well as the Reformation, maintained by Chriſtian Soveraigns. For, by the ſame Reaſon, for which, the Subjects of thoſe Powers that maintain the Reformation are tied to their Laws; by the ſame Reaſon, ſhould the Subjects of thoſe that maintain the Papacy be obliged to obey the Laws, by which they maintain it. There can be no Reaſon for a difference, if that which they maintain be not *Viſible*, before the Law maintain it. I ſuppoſe it will not be thought a good Plea, at the day of Judgment, for a Subject to ſay; that he was either *Proteſtant*

teſtant or *Papiſt*, becauſe his Soveraign was ſo. Now, Chriſtianity can be Viſible, by no other means, but, becauſe it is the Viſible Profeſſion of the Viſible Church. If it *become Inviſible*, by differences betwixt Parties, it muſt be in Soveraign Powers, to bring the Parties to tryal; Provided, that there be no tryal, but by the Viſible Church. This is the *Forbearance* that may be *extended by Paſtors*, and may be *required by the Soveraign*, in our Caſe. For, the preſent diſſenſion ſhews, that the Reformation was well begun, indeed, but not perfected. Does not the World know, that there was an Act in force, for nominating Commiſſaries, to *Reform the Eccleſiaſtical Laws* of the Kingdom? I am not to ſay, why this Act took no effect. I think I have ſaid it, when I have obſerved *the riſe of the Puritan Party*, and the ſeeds of the late War, ſowed in the beginning of *Recuſancy*. But I am to ſay, it could not have taken good effect, without taking in the Principle which I maintain. What could be more juſt, and diſcreet, then to appoint Commiſſaries, in equal number, of *Biſhops*, *Divines*, *Civil and Common Lawyers*? But what could have had force,

force, but that which had been done, to reſtore and maintain the Faith, and Laws of the Primitive Church? There are very great Reaſons, why, thoſe that deſire to ſerve the Church ſhould be ſatisfied, in all that this *Exception* will allow. There can be no Reaſon, why more ſhould be allowed. To bring them into diſpute with their *Paſtors*, is to put the *Authority of the Church* to compromiſe. To compromiſe any Law of the Kingdom, to diſpute of Divines, upon this Principle, is no more, then to oblige, either Popiſh or Fanatick Recuſants, either to ſtand to the Reſult, or to ſuffer *Penalties competent to their diſobedience*; and the hazard which the *Publick Peace* runneth, when the *Peace of Religion* is diſturbed. If that which hath been pretended be all that is intended; That ſome ſmall things are ſcrupled; Let the Legiſlative Power be ſatisfied, that the preſervation of Religion, and of the Authority of the Church; in which the preſervation of Religion conſiſteth; is only ſought. The Intereſt of the Parties, to give and to receive mutual ſatisfaction, is ſo great, that if there can be ever hope of Peace, by diſpute, this is the time, and ours the Caſe, wherein to hope for it.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Probability of recovering the Presbyterians.

FOr, I cannot have ſo hard an opinion of men, whoſe zeal, for the advancement of *Diſcipline* in the Church, I have always eſteemed; as to think them reſolved, to ruine the *Common Chriſtianity*, without hope of doing their own buſineſs; ſeeing this to be the unavoidable conſequence, of holding up the difference on foot; rather then taking up, with ſo much of their own Pretenſions, as the State of the Catholick Church will allow. Let them conſider, in the firſt place, the *Recuſancy of the Fanaticks* as well as thoſe of the Church of *Rome*; What hope their Principles can give them, either to make their Recuſancy puniſhable by the Law of the Land, or to reduce them, by convicting them of that ſenſe of the Scripture, which they only allow themſelves to convict them with? I ſet aſide, for the preſent, thoſe Propheſies of *Daniel* and the *Revelation*, by which, they pretend the Pope to be Antichriſt,

chriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters. For, I muſt argue in due place, that the Recuſancy of the Papiſt cannot be puniſhable by Law, upon this Account. But how will they, either reduce the *Recuſancy of the Papiſt*, by thoſe puniſhments, which the Recuſancy of the Fanaticks muſt ſuffer; or give the Kingdom, God, and the World, a Reaſon for the *why not?* which the beſt of them is here challenged to undertake. Then, let them conſider the wantonneſs of theſe times, and the wits of them, that think it good ſport, to call in queſtion the foundation of Chriſtianity, upon the belief of *Original ſin*, by introducing the *præexiſtence of Souls*; That think it but ſport, to make ready their ſtudies in Divinity, for the Pulpit, by *Epiſcopius his Works*; denying Original ſin both name and thing, and making *the Faith of the Holy Trinity* unneceſſary to Salvation. Or rather by the Works of the Socinians, collected and united together in *Holland*, on purpoſe to prepare us, for the ſame Apoſtaſie to Socinianiſm, which they are in ſo much danger of there. Let them conſider, what hope they have, to *make the Univerſities good Presbyterians*, that have ſowed the ſeeds

of

of this danger in them, by the diſſatisfaction they had of their Doctrine, when they were in Poſſeſſion there. Then let them tell me, what we ſhall ſay to the Papiſts, to perſwade them, to come to Church; when as they ſhall ſay, that they cannot be ſecured, that their *Curate is no Socinian, or Origeniſt.* For, the Arminian Congregations in *Holland* having admitted the Socinians into their Communion; and the Canon of the Church making all *Socinians*, in the eye of the Church, that *Communicate with Socinians*; how ſhall they be ſecured againſt thoſe, that take their Doctrine from the Socinians; Or from them, who communicate with Socinians? Beſides, let them but remember the time, when they had the Ball at their Foot; an Ordinance of Parliament for ſetting up their Preſbyteries; And how much they gained upon the People, (whom they had diſordered out of all Eccleſiaſtical Government) when they came to be at what they would be at. I think they will be at ſo great deſpair, of reducing the World to their intent, (having nothing in the Law of the Land to favour it) that they will think, that they have cauſe to thank God, of a good

good opportunity, to bring them off from an ingagement, in which they are like to gain ſo little, by hazarding the common Chriſtianity. As for the Clergy of this Church, I ſuppoſe there is none of them ſo little a Chriſtian, as to repute it a loſs to the *Party*, to ſee their Adverſaries capable of that truſt in the Church, and thoſe rewards of it, which they have ſuffered for themſelves. For, if the neceſſity of the Kingdom hath required an *Act of Oblivion*, much more muſt the *neceſſity of Religion*; which cannot be attained, without a cordial conſpiring, of thoſe that are to manage it; inforce a *mixture of Intereſt*. And that being conſidered, let any man tell me, how that can be made, but by a *Third*, in which all are alike Intereſſed; That is, by owning the Faith and the Laws of the Catholick Church, whereby the Papiſt is either reduced, or left puniſhable as the Fanatick.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

The Cure, by repairing the Revenue of the Church.

BUt all this is but a Cure for the *Symptom.* Should ſuch a *Conference* take effect, the *Cauſe* of the diſeaſe would remain intire. For, the Cauſe of our Diviſions is not theſe differences; which are too inconſiderable, to produce ſo incomparable a miſchief, as that of Schiſm. It riſes, and is fomented, by thoſe Intereſts, which the *imperfection of two Laws* of *Henry* VIII. hath created. So that, the Reformation is no way obliged to anſwer for them; Only, if it refuſe not to mend them, now that time hath diſcovered the miſchiefs which they have produced. I call them two Laws, not as if they were compriſed in *two Acts of Parliament*; but becauſe they concern, one of them the *indowment*, the other, the *Rights of the Church.* We all know, that, when the Monaſteries were given to the Crown, the indowment of thoſe Churches, which had been impropriated to thoſe Monaſte-

ries, was transferred, by the Crown, into thoſe hands, that could not Officiate the Cure of Pariſhes; as the *Monaſteries*, by ſome of their *Members*, or by their *Vicars*, had done. And, though the Right of the Crown (which could be no more then the Monaſteries had) could not abate the *Original Right of the Biſhop*, in ſetling a *reaſonable portion* upon the Vicarages; yet, in the hands of thoſe that claim under the Crown, it hath appeared ſo ſtrong, that ſuch Vicarages are generally impoveriſhed; But where the Cure lay upon the Covent, there, there now remains no indowment, *no Proviſion for the Cure of Souls*; Which falls out moſt in Cities, and places that were moſt frequented with Monaſteries, as well as with People. What the conſequence hereof hath been, it is plain enough; Even a ſort of *Mungrel Clergie of Lecturers*; Who, being Authorized by the *Biſhops Orders and Licenſe*, but *payed by the People*, to ſupply the Office of Preaching, which the Benefices of the Church were not able to maintain; Like a Pack of Dogs, that are ruled by the Huntſman that feeds them, and ſets them a work, not by the Maſter that provides for them;

No

No marvel that they owne not the Biſhops, for *Judge of their Preaching*, whether according to the Law or not. He that ſees not, that this was the ſourſe of the late War, of him is the Proverb, that ſays; *No man ſo blind as he that will not ſee.* And the worſt is, that ſo great a part of the *Gentry*, as have ſhared with the Crown, in the ſpoils of the Monaſteries, think it their *Intereſt*, to hold up that *Party*, which, they think, would juſtifie their Title in point of Conſcience; Whereas it is found by experience, that thoſe very Preachers, that would Reform the Church by force of the People, would queſtion their Tenure, as ſoon as they ſaw themſelves in condition to do it. Now, I intend not here to diſpute, that, foundations to intents of falſe Religion; as for redeeming Souls out of Purgatory; are *ipſo facto* forfeit to the true. God himſelf hath recommended this Courſe to the Church, in the Caſe of the *Cenſers* of *Core*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*; which he challenges for his own, to the uſe of the Altar, though conſecrated to the uſe of their Schiſm. But the Chriſtian Emperors of the Primitive Churches, inacting thoſe Penalties upon the Conventicles of Hereticks and

Schiſmaticks, which we read, in the laſt Book of *Theodoſius* his *Code*, the fifth Title *de Hæreticis*; have confiſcated the places where they met in nine Laws, and forfeited them to the Church, in five. Whereby it appears, that the Primitive Church, living under thoſe Laws, did not think, that goods, ſo conſecrated, do, of neceſſity, *eſchete* to the Church. My preſent purpoſe obliges me only to ſuppoſe, that the *Tithes*; which, all the world ſaw, that they had been conſecrated to God, for maintaining the *Cures of the Pariſhes*; Theſe, if there be any ſuch thing as a Church, could not be alienated from it, *without Sacriledge*. But I ſay not, therefore, that they can never be held *bona fide*; Which is that which makes the jealouſie incurable, in thoſe that find their Eſtates conſiſt much of them. And, yet, I undertake not to warrant, generally, the holding of them; Only think, that, in ſome particulars, it may be warrantable. For, when they are come into ſuch hands, that the ſupport of Eſtates depends neceſſarily upon them; and that, by *mean contracts, and originally ſuch*, as had in them no *ill Faith*; I ſay not I can warrant them, I think they may be warrant-

warrantable. Now, I know there may be an *Act of Oblivion* done by the *Church*, as well as by the Kingdom. And the Church of *Rome* knew it well enough, when they reconciled this Kingdom, under Q. *Mary*, without reſtoring theſe Poſſeſſions. By the ſame Reaſon, for which Hereticks and Schiſmaticks were always *diſpenſed with for Canonical Penalties*; (leaving the *Pardon to God*, that the Unity of the Church might be recovered) By the ſame, may the Church leave all to their own Conſciences; not warranting their pardon from God, neither yet refuſing them the *Communion*, as unpardonable. But alas, what would this Act do in our Caſe, did the whole Clergy underſtand themſelves tyed in Conſcience, by it, not ſo much as to mention, much leſs to reproach any ſuch Tenure? So long as the miſchief once done remains unprovided for, by the Law, which gives the Title and Poſſeſſion; the contradiction between the *Canonical and Popular Intereſts* can never ceaſe. But if the Kingdom conſider, that it was an Act of Parliament that did the wrong, they muſt neceſſarily find, that *nothing but an Act of Parliament* can repair it. And if the People conſi-

der, that a Parliament may tranſgreſs the truſt which they repoſe in them; (which of neceſſity may come to paſs, unleſs we make the *Parliament infallible, and the Pope not*) they will eaſily find, that a Parliament cannot repair the wrong that a former Parliament hath done, but upon the Charge of the people. For Church-goods, under Chriſtianity, ceaſe not to be the *Goods of the People*, though the *Church* be *truſted* with managing them, being founded by God for that purpoſe. And he that admits of the neceſſity of all this, will find it no conſiderable Charge for the whole Kingdom, to furniſh contribution, neceſſary for the founding and indowing of Churches, requiſite for the *Reſort and Cures* of all Aſſemblies, requiſite for a Reformation regulated by the Primitive Church. And if this be one Cauſe of our Diviſions, and that the Kingdom cannot be counted a Chriſtian Kingdom, till it take a courſe in it; let no man marvel to ſee the Judgments of God, in our Diviſions, when he ſees the *Sin of the Kingdom* continue. And if this were conſidered, the diſcourſes that walk up and down in all Aſſemblies, of relieving the Publick Charge, by ſeizing the

the pitiful remainder of the Church-Revenue, would appear to be, as they are, the productions of *Atheiſm*, not of pity to the peoples purſes.

CHAP. XXI.

By limiting and reſtoring Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline.

THe other Law, concerning the Right of the Church, in the Supremacy of the Crown, *over all Perſons, and in all Cauſes, as well Eccleſiaſtical as Civil*, may ſeem to extinguiſh the Right of the Church, over the ſame Perſons, and in the ſame Cauſes: Which could not be called *Eccleſiaſtical*, if there were no ſuch thing as a Church, (as one of the Articles of our Creed profeſſes) indowed by God, with a Right in and over the ſame. And therefore, I do not attribute the cauſe of our diviſions to it, as unjuſt, but as *indefinite*, and unlimited. And I inſtance in the Tenure of our *Eccleſiaſtical Courts*; Which, by a branch of this Law, are declared to be *the Kings Courts*, and the Judges of them *the Kings Judges*. A thing

neceſſarily following, upon the *Reſumption* of the Rights of the Crown, uſurped by the See of *Rome*, into the Crown. But which hath turned ſo great diſſatisfaction, in the eſtabliſhment of Religion by the Law of this Land; becauſe the Right of the Church, in that part of their Juriſdiction, which neceſſarily ariſeth from the Founding of the Church, by our Lord Chriſt, hath not been reſerved to the Church, by *expreſs Proviſion of Law*. Thereupon followed another Law, which gave the Judges of theſe Courts *the Priviledge of being Married*: At ſuch time, as the Law of the Land allowed not the Clergy to Marry. And by conſequence, made them no Clergy-men, whom the Law owned for the *Kings Judges* of theſe Courts; Exempting them thereby, from *the Canonical Obedience*, which they of Clergy owe their Biſhops; And leaving their Miniſtring of the Laws, in their reſpective Juriſdiction, to their own diſcretion, as well againſt, as without the conſent of their Biſhops. It is true, they ſubſiſt by *Patents* granted by their Biſhops, and other *Eccleſiaſtical Dignities*, indowed with Juriſdictions. But, the Law having declared them *the Kings Judges*,

Judges, I refer it to Judgment, whether it were any marvel, that the Biſhops, and other Dignities with Juriſdiction, ſhould diſcharge themſelves of their Juriſdiction, upon ſuch Judges, as the Law had qualified, rather then croſs the Law, in taking them upon their own charge; Part whereof, in miniſtring the *Power of the Keys*, and in *correcting the inferior Clergie*, is eſſential, and neceſſary to the Office, which Ordination makes the Clergy (Biſhops, and Preſbyters) capable of. For it is reſolved upon, by the Sages of our Laws, that, ſuch a Patent being granted for *term of life*, the Patentee is inabled to exerciſe the whole Juriſdiction, without and againſt the conſent of him that grants it; and ſhall be maintained againſt him, in ſo doing, by the Law of the Land. I am neither to blame, nor to excuſe them, that have not done their utmoſt, to redeem the Office, which we are conſecrated to a capacity of managing, out of that Poſſeſſion, which the Law of the Land thus ingageth. For, it is granted, and it is to be granted, that *the Church cannot pardon ſin*; As if it could pardon him that is not qualified for pardon: Or keep him from pardon that is. But the Church pardons

dons ſin, by bringing him to be *qualified for pardon that is not*: And declaring him *pardoned that is*. If we were Fanaticks, and believed no *Condition* of pardon, but only, to imagine that we are pardoned; There would be no Church, no Keys of the Church to manage. If we believed, as ſome underſtand the Council of *Trent*; That ſin is pardoned, by *ſubmitting it to the Keys of the Church*: And that the mortification of the fleſh ſerves only to redeem the *temporal Penalty*, remaining due when the ſin is pardoned; A Lay Judge, having knowledge, might manage the Keys of the Church, as well as a Prieſt. But, becauſe a notorious ſinner becomes qualified for pardon, when the Concupiſcence is mortified, which his ſin gratifies: And, becauſe he *undergoes his Mortification*, becauſe he cannot have the Communion otherwiſe; Therefore are they only, that conſecrate the Euchariſt, to judge, whether he be qualified or not, and to give or refuſe him that which they conſecrate. And, *Commutation of Penance*, when it ſuppoſes not, the inward contrition of the heart performed, by outward mortification of the fleſh, is but the betraying of that Soul to damnation, whom

whom it admits to Communion, not being qualified for it. True it is, nothing hinders him, that is discharged of Excommunication, to become qualified by his own private endeavours. But, God would never have founded his Church, upon the Power of the Keys, if the Office thereof were only, not to hinder, and not also to procure, notorious sinners, to be fit for Communion with the Church. And, that to procure, must be the Office of those, who, by the Foundation of the Church, are to judge, who is fit and who not. If therefore the Law of the Land provide not, that that Office of the Church may be in force, to that effect, for which the Power of the Keys is given them that consecrate the Eucharist; Is it any marvel, that the Judgment and Vengeance of God should lye so heavy upon the Land, professing Reformation, and not inabling that which it professeth to take place? My present business therefore is now to say; That the Interests which cause our Divisions are so far imputable to these Laws, as, without the Reforming of the Laws, they cannot be cured. Two of these Interests I name, contradictory the one to the other, in their Preten-

Pretenſes. For, what doth the World complain of, but of the abuſe of Excommunication; daily imployed, to inforce the contentious Juriſdiction of theſe Courts; Never imployed, to the correction of ſin, and recalling of ſinners; Which, being the Office of thoſe that receive the *Power of the Keys* by Ordination, cannot be exerciſed by the Laity, without Sacriledge. Now, granting, that the Uſurpation of the See of *Rome*, or the Indulgence of Chriſtian Princes and States have procured, or granted to the Clergy, a larger Juriſdiction then their Office required; It would have been no Inconvenience, that the whole Juriſdiction ſhould be inforced, by Excommunication, ſignifying impriſonment by the Law of the Land; If a difference had been made, between the *proper Juriſdiction of the Church*, and the *Acceſſory*. For, in this part of it, it is an oppreſſion to Chriſtian Subjects, that they ſhould be barred the *Communion*, for maintaining themſelves and their Right, by Law, in matters of any Right of this World; Though the Clergy were Judges, by the Law of the Land. But it would be no oppreſſion to them, that the Juriſdiction

of

of the Kings Courts ſhould be inforced by impriſonment; which Excommunication might ſignifie, by the Law of the Land, without ſignifying *a Bar to the Communion of the Euchariſt*; if theſe were duely diſtinguiſhed. In the mean time, the whole indowment of the Church, in a manner, being *irrecoverable* by theſe Courts, without Excommunication; the ſcandal of theſe Juriſdictions becomes a Popular Plea, to ſtrip the Clergy of their maintenance; Tyths being no farther paid, then it pleaſe Frantick Fanaticks, or contentious neighbours, to do right of good will; Knowing that, Excommunication being odious, Impriſonment is not like eaſily to follow upon it. I ſaid, that there is another Intereſt on foot, upon a Pretenſe contradictory to this. And I mean that, which vulgar *Profeſſors of the Laws of the Land* ſet up to themſelves, out of theſe ſcandals; To reduce the whole Juriſdiction of Eccleſiaſtical Courts under the Juriſdiction of the Laws of the Land, and thoſe Courts that miniſter the ſame. This Intereſt eſpouſeth the Opinion, which voids the Article of our Creed, that profeſſes *One Catholick Church*; making Excommunication, and Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction,

diction, founded by our Lord Christ, a meer Imposture; declareth it uncapable of any Sacriledge, to be committed in the using of it. In the mean time, the Clergy, whose Interest is no ways concerned, in the *Scandals, which the Ecclesiastical Courts* may give; Further, then as they are hindred, by the said Courts, to cure their Scandals, by the due Use of their own Office; do suffer, not only the Scandals which are done under colour of their Patents; But even the affronts of the Ecclesiastical Courts themselves; Receiving Appeals, from the Censure of their Bishops upon the Clergy. For, a few examples, serving the Bishops, not to imploy that Jurisdiction, which is so easily affronted, it must be acknowledged, that the debauches of the Clergy are come to that height, that, till they be Reformed, Reformation is not duely pretended against the See of *Rome*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

The ground of the proper Intereſt of the Church.

BUt perhaps there be thoſe, that are perſwaded by the *Leviathan*, that a Church is nothing elſe but *a Chriſtian Common-wealth.* And that the Civil Power thereof, which is Soveraign, hath full Right to injoyn whatſoever it pleaſe, for the Chriſtian Religion; exacting what Penalties it pleaſe of Recuſants. There be others beſides the Leviathan, that have maintained ſome branches of the ſame Opinion; but he is the only man, that hath looked the whole Queſtion in the Face, with this Anſwer. I will but relate the Iſſue, which his own Reſolution hath driven him to, and leave him to Judgment. For, having objected to himſelf, in his Latine Book *de Cive*, that which is obvious to all Underſtandings; That then, a Chriſtian may be juſtly puniſhed, for his Chriſtianity; He anſwers, that it is no inconvenience, that he ſhould; Becauſe, by ſuffering, he purchaſes

chaſes an abundant reward. I know not whether any man told him, or whether himſelf took notice, that this was the anſwer of *Julian* the Apoſtate, making himſelf ſport with the complaints of the Chriſtians; That they were beholding to him for the Kingdom of Heaven, which they gained by ſuffering his Perſecutions; But, that it was not for the credit of his doctrine, to bring Chriſtian Princes into the predicament of *Julian* the Apoſtate. And therefore, upon ſecond thoughts, his Leviathan anſwers; That a Subject is bound to obey all that his Soveraign commands in Religion, whether he be Chriſtian or not: Inſomuch that, if he command him to renounce Chriſt, he is bound to do it with his mouth, and ſhall be ſaved, believing in him with his heart, nevertheleſs. This anſwer ſhews the neceſſary iſſue of this Opinion; That he who holds it, if he be as bad as his word, is as neceſſarily an Apoſtate, as *Julian* the Apoſtate. The hope of Salvation, and the Right of Communion with the Church, lyes not only in the heart, which *believes to righteouſneſs*, but in the mouth, which *profeſſeth to Salvation*. The Profeſſion, which is made at our Baptiſm, is a condition,

Condition, without which it cannot be had. It is the taking up of Chriſts Croſs, which the Goſpel requireth. He that declares himſelf free, in any Caſe whatſoever, to renounce Chriſt, though he hath not done it, hath declared himſelf free of the Bond, which he entred into at his Baptiſm; And as he is no more a Chriſtian to God, no more ſhould he be to the Church. If further he ſay; As the Propoſitions firſt maintained, and afterwards recanted, by his late Diſciple at *Cambridge*, do import; That there is no difference between good and bad, before Civil Power that is Soveraign inact it; Then muſt it be ſaid further, that he is properly an Atheiſt. For, if God govern not the World, if he reward not the good, if he puniſh not the bad, though man do not, (pardon me God and all good Chriſtians, if I repeat Blaſphemy, that it may never more be repeated) then is he not God. Particularly, if Civil Power can oblige a man to ſay or ſwear, that which he means not, there remains not that Ground for Civil Society, which the Heathen themſelves (whom nevertheleſs S. *Paul* truly calls *Atheiſts*) maintained. For, what Ground for Civil truſt, if

there be no Law, before Civil truſt, to puniſh the falſifying of it? Let him that conſiders this Conſequence, (neceſſary upon all Opinions, that diſtinguiſh not the matter of Eccleſiaſtical Law, conſequent to the State and Conſtitution of the Church, from the Force it hath, to be a Law of the Kingdom, by the Act of the Kingdom) I ſay, let him anſwer in Conſcience, whether thoſe Laws, by which the Rights of the Crown, Uſurped by the See of *Rome*, are Reſumed into it, did proceed upon this Opinion or not. For my part, I remember very well a ſolemn Proteſtation, which one of them makes, that the intent was not, to innovate any thing in Religion, by vindicating the Rights of the Crown. And therefore do infer, that none of them can be underſtood, to extinguiſh the Rights of Religion, concurrent with the Rights of the Crown, in Church-matters, which it doth not diſtinguiſh; Knowing how difficult it is, to diſtinguiſh between them; As not knowing, that ever the ground, upon which they are to be diſtinguiſhed, was delivered till now. But there is an Act of the V. of Q. *Elizabeth*, by which, that abatement in the ſenſe of the *Supremacy*

of

of the Crown in Church-matters, which had been declared by her *Injunctions*, from the beginning of her Raign, to prevent misconstructions, was made a Law of the Land. This Act, because it undertaketh not to limit the *Supremacy*, by distinguishing the Interest of the Crown from the Interest of the Church, (for the difficulty of satisfying all Consciences) gives the Subject leave, to declare the sense, in which he takes that Oath; reserving to himself, that which Religion requires a Christian to reserve, for the Church. Which was not the sense of them that believed no *Catholick Church*, no Visible Right of it. And, by vertue of this Declaration, it is, that my self have undertaken to declare that limitation, which the *Catholick Church* requireth. For, how many Prelates and Divines of this Church, (King *James* of excellent Memory in particular) have done the same? But it is no other, then that which the Canons of K. *James* declare; when they describe this *Supremacy* to be the same, which *the Godly Kings of Gods Ancient People*, which *the Roman Emperors of the Primitive times* (before that corruption came in, which we *Protest* against) did

exercise. Here have you the due bounds of this Supremacy, setled by Law, upon the true ground of it. For it is manifest, that it cannot be derived from the Rights of the Kings of Gods Ancient People alone; Becaus there could be no *Catholick Church*, before the calling of the Gentiles. But, the Empire, imbracing the Faith, when the Church was setled upon that Faith, and those Laws, that are now as Visible, as the Laws of *England*, from which present Titles are derived, can be Visible; must needs have that Right, from which the Right of all present Soveraignties must be derived; Becaus the *Church*, (whose Intereſt concurreth with the Intereſt of them all, in the same matters) is always *One* and the same, and ought so to be, from the first to the second Coming of Christ. And that answers any difficulty, that may be objected, when any Law of any Roman Emperor, or other Christian Prince or State, seems to *infringe the Canons* of the Church. For, the Protection of the Crown being of such advantage as it is, both for the inlarging, and maintaining of Christianity; It is enough, that the Church can continue *One* and the same *Visible Church*, by one

one and the ſame Viſible Laws; Though the force and effect of them be hindred now and then, here and there, by ſome Acts of Secular Power, which, in ſome regards, may advance the Church as much, as they hinder it in others. It was neceſſary for the Crown, under *Henry* the VIII, to vindicate the Supremacy from the pretenſe of the Popes Secular Power; which had been on foot divers Ages afore. And therefore, not to have to do with him, that pretended to aſſoil the *Subjects* of Princes, whom he ſhould excommunicate, of their *Allegiance*, till they might owne him, upon terms, conſiſtent with the Protection they owe their People. And it was ſtill more neceſſary, under *Edward* the VI. when the Reformation was inacted; which, they knew well enough, that the Pope would not endure. But, when the Right of the Crown in Church-matters is declared by Law, to be the ſame, which *the Kings of Gods Ancient People*, and the *firſt Chriſtian Emperors* did exerciſe, the ground of that Intereſt, and the bounds of that Intereſt, which the Church muſt challenge, if it will continue a Church, are declared to be the ſame, which the Faith and the Laws

of the Whole Church from the beginning do allow.

CHAP. XXIII.

Of reſtoring and reforming the Juriſdictions of the Crown, and of the Church, in Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes.

AND this makes the Reformation of our Eccleſiaſtical Laws as eaſie, as it is viſibly the cure of all diſtempers in Religion among us. It is in brief this; That the Juriſdiction, which may by this means appear to the Kingdom, to be inveſted in the Church by Gods Law, be, by a Law of the Kingdom, reſtored to the Clergy; To the *Biſhops* in chief, then, to the *Chapters of their Cathedrals*, and to their *Archdeacons*; (And to theſe, not without the Aſſiſtance of the *Principal Clergie*, of their Reſpective Juriſdictions) the Judges of the Eccleſiaſtical Courts continuing the Kings Judges, as they are now by Law; to manage the Intereſt of the Crown, (in all the Rights thereof, reſumed into the Crown, by the Acts of Supremacy) according to the Roman Laws,

Laws, in thoſe Ages of Chriſtendom, which paſſed before the Uſurpation of the See of *Rome* had taken place. If it be ſaid; That it is not Viſible, when thoſe Uſurpations took place; I ſhall allow all the time, which that Code of the Canons contains, that Pope *Adrian* ſent to *Charles* the Great; In whoſe time, there can be no pretenſe of Uſurpation, upon the Temporalties of Princes, by the See of *Rome*. This Code is yet read, under the Name of *Codex Canonum Eccleſiæ Romanæ*. I have commended the Juſtice and Wiſdom of that Commiſſion, which was deſigned under *Henry* the VIII, and *Edward* the VI, for the *qualities of Perſons* limited by it. But I do not think it poſſible for any Commiſſion, to *Reform the Alterations* introduced by the Popes Canon Law, after that time, in one Kings Raign, with that circumſpection which is requiſite. The Juriſdiction which the Church challenges, by Gods Law, can not be diſtinctly ſtated, with more ſatisfaction to all Intereſts, preſerving that of Religion, then by a Commiſſion ſo qualified. The Intereſt of the Kingdom, in preſerving the ſtudy of the Roman Laws, hath always been thought conſiderable.

But how ſhall the ſtudy of them be maintained, if the *Authority* of them be not maintained? Or how ſhall that Authority be maintained, but by *adopting* them into the Law of the Kingdom, in matters neceſſary to be provided for by Law, but not provided for, by the native Law of the Kingdom? Or what proviſion can there be, by the native Law of the Kingdom, for thoſe Cauſes, which, for ſo many hundred years before the Reformation, the Popes Canon Law had ſentenced, by the Authority of the Kingdom? There is an *Intereſt of Religion in Matrimonial Cauſes*, in *Teſtamentary Cauſes*, in Cauſes ariſing upon *Elections of Corporate Clergie*, in Cauſes of *Diſpenſation in Canons*, in Cauſes of *Tithes*, in divers ſorts of Cauſes, beſides thoſe which the Power of the Keys, in the Diſcipline of the People, and the Correction of Inferior Clergy occaſioneth. Let me not ſay, that it were *Barbarous*, for a flouriſhing Kingdom, in a flouriſhing Age, for all other Learning, to reduce the Tryal of them, to the *Arbitrary Verdicts of Juries*; (Who can never underſtand the Grounds, upon which the matter of Fact is to be ſtated) when I can ſo clearly ſay, that there

there can be nothing more like to meer Tyranny, then *Arbitrary Juſtice*; nor Juſtice more Arbitrary, then, where it is manifeſt, that there can have been no other Law provided, becauſe the Canon Law hath been hitherto uſed. As for thoſe *Cauſes*, which are *proper to the Church*, as riſing from the *Conſtitution* of it; how can it ſtand with Religion, and Reformation in Religion, which we pretend, to try them otherwiſe, then by thoſe, ~~which~~ of whom the Kingdom ſhall be ſatisfied, by ſuch a Commiſſion, that they are by Gods Law capable of Authority to do it? And the Intereſt of the Crown, and of the Subjects, which it is bound to protect, ſhall be ſecured, when proviſion is made, by adopting the Roman Laws, for managing the Rights of the Crown, reſumed by the Act of Supremacy, within thoſe Bounds, which the Roman Laws maintained, before the Uſurpation of the See of *Rome*. It cannot be denied, that *the Popes Canon Law* (which the Law of the Land hath already adopted, ſo far as it contradicteth not the Law of the Land) provideth for many things, not provided for by the *Primitive Canons*, within the Compaſs of the Roman Laws. And it would

would be too much raſhneſs, *to recal that Adoption*, and to leave ſo much matter to arbitrary Juſtice, rather then retain a Proviſion, which the Law and Religion profeſſed by the Kingdom owns not the Original of, though it owne the matter it hath adopted. For, whatſoever ſhall prove, by time and tryal, to hinder the *Reformation*, which we pretend thus to ground, and thus to bound, the faults that ſhall be found by experience muſt open the way of mending it, becauſe the Cure muſt be as particular, as the diſeaſe is. And upon theſe Terms, it can be no diſhonour to the Kingdom, and to the Reformation which it profeſſeth, to uſe the Canon Law which it adopteth, till time ſhew the way of amending thoſe particulars, which, time ſhall ſhew, that the Reformation pretended requires to be changed. For inſtance, we know, that ſince *Henry* VIII. it is not the cuſtom to take any degree in Canon Law; Notwithſtanding the Law of the Land adopteth the Canon Law. And, accordingly we all know, that Graduates in the Civil Law of the Romans are priviledged, by the Eccleſiaſtical Law of the Kingdom. I would fain have any of them,

them, that would wear the Face, and the Conſcience of a good Chriſtian, and a good Engliſh man both; Give me a reaſonable Account of theſe their Tenures, waving that which I here ſet forth for them; whom they will think too bold with their Freehold for it. For my part, who am no mans foe, but my own, in publiſhing my Opinion thus freely, upon this Exigent; I think I do good ſervice to them, with my Country, to ſet forth this Account, why and how the Roman Laws deſerve to be adopted into the Laws of the Kingdom; Namely, that the Popes Canon Law, which is already adopted, may be limited within thoſe Bounds, with the Roman Laws; (And *by conſequence, the Primitive Canons of the Church*, which the Roman Laws acknowledge and inforce) do either preſcribe or allow. I would make a further Offer, of introducing the Roman Laws, both into the *Study* of the Law of the Land, and into *Authority* in our Courts of *Equity*; And of reconciling, thereby, the Croſs-Intereſts of the Profeſſions, upon competence of Juriſdictions. But, though I muſt needs have that Opinion my ſelf, which, I can ſee nothing againſt, ſeeing much

much for it; yet I will trouble no man with an Opinion, which neither my Profeſſion obliges mē, nor my ſkill inables me to make out. It ſhall be enough for me to obſerve, that they ſhall deſerve to be counted *Profeſſors of the Roman Laws*, that are truſted to miniſter the Canon Laws, by thoſe Bounds, which the Roman Laws allow. As for the Concurrence of that Juriſdiction which is proper to the Clergy, by Gods Law, and that which is reſumed by the Crown, to be *miniſtred by the Profeſſors of the Roman Laws*; I do acknowledge it cannot be ended, but by Appeals; The iſſue whereof, whither it ought to reſort, when it is time to ſay, it will be then time to ſay alſo, how theſe Intereſts are reconcileable. In the mean time, Epiſcopacy being owned by the Law of the Kingdom, and the Law of God both, to be that which the whole Church, from the beginning acknowledgeth; I think I do my Country, and the Church of God in it no diſſervice, to propoſe a plaiſter large enough for the Sore of it, that ſhall come within the bounds which I have propoſed. For, the Chapters of Cathedral Churches are, by their *Birth-right*, *Counſellors* to the Biſhops, and

and *Aſſiſtants*, in his whole Office; The *Archdeacon his Miniſter*, and principal Commiſſary. Thoſe, by the Rule firſt ſet on foot by the Apoſtles, and obſerved always by the Church, of planting Cathedral Churches in Cities, and making the Churches planted in Cities Cathedral Churches, for the Government of all Chriſtendom within the Territories of thoſe Cities. This being, by his *Order*, *Miniſterial* to them, as well as to the Biſhop, when both have part in the ſame Office. And here I place the hinge, upon which I hang the Reconcilement of *the preſumed Intereſt of the Presbyterians*, with the true Intereſt of the Clergy; Suppoſing the Conference propoſed to have taken effect, and produced a *Requeſt* of both Parties, to the *Legiſlative Power of the Kingdom*, to make a Law of thoſe particulars, upon which they are come to agreement, to be received, and to exerciſe their Miniſtry. For, the Office of the Clergy being ſeparated from the Intereſt of the Crown, by an Act of the Kingdom; And the Profeſſors of the Roman Laws truſted to manage this Intereſt, in behalf of the Subject; (Only aſſiſting the Clergy, in that part of the Juriſ-

Juriſdiction proper to the Church, which will concern the Intereſt of Subjects, as Members of the Church, as well as the Office of the Clergy) What ſhall hinder them, the Preſbyterians, as well as the reſt of the Clergy, to exerciſe the Zeal, which they have always profeſſed, towards the Reforming of the converſation of the People, in aſſiſting that Diſcipline, as well over the *Inferior Clergie as the People*, which the *Chapters of Cathedral Churches*, and the *Archdeacons* ſhall, by the Biſhop and under the Biſhop, be truſted with? For what need all this hinder the *Prerogative* of the Biſhops *Negative* Vote; when as there will be more to do under him, then hands will be found for, reſerving to him thoſe cauſes, which he would chuſe to reſerve? For, that will be found no more then requiſite, to preſerve his *Prerogative*, *that nothing be done without him*; when nothing is done without him, but that which he ſhall chuſe to be eaſed in. He that knows what the *Hierarchy* ſignifies, muſt needs underſtand, that the ſame means, which preſerved the *Whole Church in Unity*, ſo far and wide for place, ſo long for time, as Unity prevailed in the Church, and Chriſtianity with it and by it,

it, knows that the ſame muſt be uſed, to preſerve Unity in the *Church of this Kingom*; The Queſtion being, how to Reform it ſo, that it may continue a Member of the Whole.

CHAP. XXIV.

Some Principal Canons to be reſtored, in our preſent State.

FOr, let no man think, that any Law can be effectual to this purpoſe, till the Caſe be ſtated, which the Law is provided for. We are in the State of Schiſm, in ſpite of our teeth: Though we are to clear our ſelves of the crime of Schiſm, upon the Terms ſetled; which cannot clear us, if it be poſſible, that any other ſhould clear us. King *Henry* the VIII. had reaſon to declare, that he and his Kingdom ſhould have nothing to do with the Pope, that Excommunicated him for his Divorce; So many Popes having diſcharged the Subjects of Princes Excommunicate, of their Allegiance. But, to make good the Proteſtation, that he intended no further change in Religion; I need

need not say what he did, to give succeeding Popes occasion to recal the folly of that Pope, which Excommunicated him, by a timely Reconcilement. In the mean time, the way to preserve the Kingdom in Peace was, to have nothing to do with the See of *Rome*. But, had he been so well advised, as to have maintained his Divorce upon the terms which I plead for; What could the Pope have said to that Code of Canons, which Pope *Adrian* the I. sent to *Charles* the Great; which I would have this Church to owne? For it concludes, with a Synod of the Province of *Rome*, under Pope *Gregory* the II. which pronounces *Anathema*, to whosoever shall marry his deceased Brothers Wife. Let *Julius* II. Pope, that dispensed with *Henry* the VIII. and his Marriage with the Lady *Katherine* of *Spain*, have bethought himself, how to come clear of this *Anathema*; the Authority of the See of *Rome* being intire. For K. *Henry* the VIII. or at least for his Kingdom, it was and is enough, that, so long as he owned the Authority of that See, he must needs be troubled in conscience at that Marriage, by which he must needs incur it, preferring the former Act of

of a Council under *Gregory* the II. Pope, before a Bull of *Julius* the II. Pope, dispensing in an *Anathema* of the said Council. For, as the Primitive Canons are to be preferred, in Church-Law, before the looſneſs of ſucceeding Ages, being ſtill further from the Apoſtles; So the Act of the Council, under the Regular Power of the Pope, is to be preferred before a Bull; which now paſſeth without the Conſiſtory, as the Popes perſonal Act, after the unlimited abſolute Power of the Pope hath taken place. As for King *Edward* the VI. profeſſing the Reformation, and proteſting it as he did; ſo that the See of *Rome* could have no pretenſe of correſpendence, without owning it themſelves; there ſucceeds the neceſſity of a State of Schiſm, upon the Excommunication following; The Crime of Schiſm remaining on that ſide that Excommunicates, for vindicating and reſtoring the Faith and the Laws of the Whole Church. This being the ſtate of our Caſe: and the Laws of the Whole Church, and the Faith thereof, neceſſary to the Title, that muſt juſtifie Reformation without the Conſent of the Whole; Is it not manifeſt, to all Underſtandings, that the Law, by which

this State is to be Governed, muſt be ſuch a Proviſion, as the Laws of the Whole Church inable a part of it to make for it ſelf, in the Caſe? And therefore, we muſt affirm, as many of us as would have no ſhare in the Schiſm, as to God; being thus ſecured, that, to the Church, we are not chargeable with it; That there is nothing to hinder ſuch a Proviſion, but the miſunderſtanding of them: And that we ſee not, what the Conſequence of our own Profeſſion requires. A reaſon that preſſes me ſo hard, that I do willingly expoſe my ſelf to the diſpleaſure of all, that ſhall find themſelves diſguſted, with this freedom; Only to give my ſelf the ſatisfaction of publiſhing it, whatſoever diſpleaſure it procure me; As being ſatisfied, that there is no other cure for our preſent diſtempers. For in the firſt place, it muſt be ſaid, that it is in vain to talk of Regular Government, by the Canons of the Church, without reſtoring the liberty of Synods, to the reſpective Provinces. Not as if the Church needed any abatement, in the Act of *Henry* the VIII., which forbiddeth making, and perhaps adviſing of Canons to be made, without the Aſſent of the Crown. But becauſe the World knows,

knows, it was the Uſurped Legatine Power, that had brought Synods to nothing, by Uſurping upon the Ordinary. And therefore, it is but Juſtice in the Crown, finding the Right of Synods, the Subjects thereof, Uſurped by the See of *Rome*; to reſtore it to the Subjects, upon whom the Uſurpation had been made; The Supremacy of the Crown being ſufficiently provided for, by the ſaid Act: And, the force of all Acts of Synods depending upon the Legiſlative Power of the Kingdom. In the next place, it is to no purpoſe, to talk of Reformation in the Church, unto Regular Government, without reſtoring the Liberty of chuſing Biſhops, and the Priviledge of injoying them, to the Synods, Clergy and People of each Dioceſe. I ſay not, depriving the Crown of the due Intereſt of a Negative, to any Perſon to be promoted a Biſhop, in any inſtance of his Promotion. God forbid it ſhould come into my thought. But, the Supremacy being ſo provided for, ſo evident is the Right of the Synods, Clergy and People, in the making of thoſe, of whom they conſiſt, and by whom they are to be governed, that I need mark no other Reaſon, for

the neglect of Episcopacy, but the neglect of it; For the neglect of Cathedral Churches, but the neglect, & alienation of their Office, under and with their Bishops. This for certain, had not the See of *Rome* introduced so much disorder, in the creating of Bishops, that we have not yet cured it, we should have heard of it with both ears, from their Advocates. And, if I may credit a person of unquestionable credit, his late Majesty was so convinced hereof, when he was at *Oxford*, that he offered to part with it, if a way were shewed how to do it. As for the translating of Bishops; which done, as it is, of course, must needs render the Office unfruitful to their People; As no man can deny, that there ought to be a course, for dispensing in the Canon, for publick good; So cannot this pretense of publick good come to effect, unless it be maintained by the Office of Synods, to whom the State of the Church vindicates the Right of it. That which I said afore, of Appeals, belongs to this place. For, what Law can provide, that, in Causes reserved to the Bishop, parties shall rest content always with his sentence? Or whether can Ecclesiastical Causes resort, from him, but to the Synod of

of the Province? Again, what Chriſtian Kingdom could ever prevent a mixture of Cauſes; That is, a concurrence of Intereſt, between the Soveraign Power, and the Office of the Church? Or what danger can be imaginable, to this Crown, in doing Right to the Church; Having only its own Subjects to deal with? Or what can be more ready, to receive Appeals of this Nature, then a Commiſſion of Judges, delegate, as well by the Synods as by the Crown, for the expedition of ſuch Cauſes, in which, the pretenſe of the Subject, as well as the Intereſt of Religion, may be concerned? As for matter of Faith; Having admitted all that hath been decreed within the time of the ſix truly General Councils; I dare ſay, that there is nothing, that the See of *Rome* can charge upon the Socinians, or Anabaptiſts, or any Sect of our Fanaticks, that is not condemned, in the Arians, Pelagians, or other Sects, which the Whole Church hath condemned, during that time. So that there can be no cauſe, why Chriſtianity ſhould not be maintained, by the Reformation, during this State of Schiſm, but neglecting the true conſequence of that which we our ſelves profeſs.

CHAP. XXV.

Two Laws more, neceſſary to the Reformation of the Church.

THeſe are the principal points, in the Canons of the Whole Church, which the Profeſſion of Reforming the Church obliges us to reſtore. There are two points more, the one concerning the People, the other the Inferior Clergy; which, till they be reſtored, our Reformation cannot be that which it pretendeth. That all, who ſhall be convicted in Law, of capital or infamous Crimes, ſtand Excommunicate *ipſo facto*, and if Execution paſs, be deprived of Chriſtian Burial, unleſs they reconcile themſelves to the Church; Unleſs the Law make this good, how ſhould the Kingdom be counted a Chriſtian Kingdom? For, if ſcandalous Crimes, that are notorious, be allowed Communion with the Church, how can it be a Church? Conviction, which is the Act of the Law, making the Crime notorious, how can Chriſtianity be protected, and the Church not able to renounce them that

that renounce it by their deeds? The increaſe of ſin ſo flagrant in this Nation, ſince the War began, makes the neceſſity of this Law flagrant. I was ſpeaking of the Leviathan, that Monſter of a Chriſtian, that with one Book, (allowed by the Act of Oblivion, becauſe the Doctrine was not damned, when the Perſon was pardoned) hath introduced that Deluge of Atheiſm and Prophaneneſs, which we are ready to be drowned with. Let Publick Juſtice have the convicting of the Blaſphemies which he hath taught, if the Church be not in Caſe to bear the envy of ſuch a truſt. But to account for ſuch a crime, by a pecuniary mulct, is to ſell our Chriſtianity, at the price, at which it is defied. Unleſs Infamy follow, and Excommunication, to bring it on, farewel Chriſtianity, which compoundeth with Apoſtaſie. The Father of the Sect thinks, I believe, that he hath as good Right to the Communion, as the reſt of His Majeſties Subjects; Who, though he ſhould profeſs Penitence for his crime, could not be believed; having given the World warning, that he may be bound to ſay, and to ſwear, that which he doth not believe. What courſe but this,

to ſuppreſs the Vanity of committing Murther, under the name of a Duel? For, in all Common-wealths, where mens memory is not liable to Infamy, ſin is not out of countenance. In that which is Chriſtian, what can be infamous, if to forfeit Communion with the Church be not? As for Adultery, what puniſhment hath this Kingdom left for it? Or how ſhall it be counted a Chriſtian Kingdom, having none? Be the tryal of it, as Civil Intereſt ſhall require. If it paſs without Excommunication, though the Law of the Land lay no hold on it, what can clear the Kingdom of the expectation of Gods vengeance? By conſequence hereof, they that are convicted of Simony in Civil Juſtice, muſt remain *Irregular*, to the Church; That is, though their Ordination can never be void, yet their perſons muſt remain incapable of any truſt, which their Clergy ſhould make them capable of. And why ſhould not the Priviledge of their Clergy ceaſe, and they remain Excommunicate for ſuch a Crime? The other Law, concerning the Clergy, is the confining of every one to one Dioceſe; Which is but the Reſtoring of that Order, which the See of *Rome* had diſordered, on

on purpoſe to ingage in the diſorders of it, all that they obliged by ſuch Priviledges. For, the Priviledges reſerved to the Crown, Nobility, and Biſhops, whereby the abuſe is but diſplaced, will not be conſiderable, in compariſon with the Reformation which it hindreth. It ſeems ſtrange to thoſe, that find themſelves Intereſted, that two Benefices with Cure ſhould be allowed in one Dioceſe, not in ſeveral Dioceſes, though at leſs diſtance. But the Law cannot be underſtood to allow all that it forbids not; Becauſe there may be Reaſon, why the Publick good will not allow the forbidding of that, which is left to the Conſcience of particular perſons. Were all Benefices reſtored to that Proviſion, which the Cures might require, perhaps Priviledges of Pluralities might be extinguiſhed. In the mean time, is it not enough, that, whatſoever the Quality be, the Office of Prieſt and Deacon is relative to their Reſpective Biſhops? that no man can be anſwerable to one Biſhop for a Charge, in which he is anſwerable to another for the ſame? Which if it hold not in one and the ſame Dioceſe, the Reaſon of the difference is both ſufficient and evident.

Always,

Always, the Ground being laid, that the Reformation of the Church is to be Ruled by the Canons of the Primitive Church; there can be no more queſtion in this, then is in any thing, where the Primitive Inſtitution, is as Viſible, as the decay and abuſe. But this will principally concern Archdeacons, and the Dignified Clergy, which are to bear a part in the Biſhops Office. For how ſhould they be charged with that, which they are not charged to execute?

CHAP. XXVI.

Of Forbearance, due or not due, in two Inſtances.

I Have propoſed a Conference, I have determined, that all is to be tryed by the agreement of the Catholick Church; But if we ſtay till the Parties agree to that, there muſt be no Conference. What have we to overcome this difficulty with? Conſidering, how the neceſſity of loſing all Religion preſſes all Parties, and conſidering how ſlight the pretenſes of diſſatisfaction at the Act of Uniformity are; though

though I cannot depart from my claim, that the Reformation cannot duely be made, but by and to that Pattern; yet I ſee it may be laid aſide in the Tryal, not ſuppoſing that the Will of God is declared by it. But, if the advantage be not allowed, which the conſent of Chriſtendom from the beginning hath, in the judgment of common Reaſon, above any Opinion of this time, or any Party pretending Reformation; what courſe can they hold, that have not reaſonable Creatures to deal with? For how can they be counted reaſonable, that prefer their own Reaſon, before the Reaſon of Chriſtendom? Or how ſhall they diſtinguiſh their *private Spirits*, from the Enthuſiaſms of Fanaticks, that inſiſt upon thoſe Interpretations, and Conſequences of Scripture, which, had any man ſeen before them, the Church had never been as it hath been? In fine, the Caſe being ſtated, I ſee no cauſe, to apprehend any obſtinacy in the Parties, to prefer any faction, or partiality, before Reaſon ſo manifeſted, and ſo concerning the common Chriſtianity. I will inſiſt upon two Inſtances. All the World knows, that one of the abuſes, which made the neceſſity of Reformation

moſt

moſt appear, was that of private Maſſes; where the Euchariſt was celebrated, and the people did not communicate. It is as well known, that the Reformation according to *Calvin* contents it ſelf with four Communions a year; but no Aſſembly without Preaching. The Church of *England* hath aimed at the Communion every Lords-day and Holy-day; at Sermons, as frequent as can be had, ſo as to maintain the reverence due to Religion, to Preaching, and to the Church. What queſtion can there be in Religion, that the Euchariſt is the principal Office of Religious Aſſemblies? What pretenſe of Reformation, in reſtoring Preaching, by ſilencing the Euchariſt? It will be ſaid, that there is fear of prophaning ſo Religious an Office. But where is Reformation, if it make not the people fit for it? The Papiſts ſay; Private Maſſes are not commanded; they would have the people communicate, and incourage them to it. But what do they do to bring them to it? Surely more then they do, that ſilence the Euchariſt for the Sermon; That are not contented, till ſo much Preaching be commanded, that they know the Euchariſt muſt be ſilenced.

Let

Let them think what abilities are requiſite, to maintain ſo frequent Preaching, that there ſhall be no time for the Euchariſt; Let them think of the Scandals, that muſt needs fall out, for want of due abilities; and they will find cauſe, I doubt not, to prefer the Whole Church, before a late Party: and abate the Sermon, to reſtore the Euchariſt. Eſpecially, ſeeing the Law of this Land muſt be changed, to bear out what others have done; though it is manifeſt, they never gave any reaſon for it. They will ſee cauſe to think, that the beſt Preaching is that which may fit the people for the Euchariſt; by underſtanding the Covenant of Baptiſm, and the importance of daily renewing and reſtoring it, by Communion in the Euchariſt. The other Inſtance ſhall be the Pſalms; that are ſung in Cathedral Churches, but allowed to be read where there is not company to ſing them. For it is plain enough; what excuſes are made, and what indeavours uſed, to ſilence this part of Gods Service: and to turn the Pſalms; which this Church, with the Whole Church, appointeth for devotion; into Leſſons of Inſtruction only. Hence all the Plea againſt the Old Tranſ-

lation

lation with points; all the indeavors to crowd in the Pſalms in Rhime, inſtead of the Pſalter, and all uſe which the Church hath always made of it. But, did not partiality and faction prevail over that Reaſon, which all Chriſtendom before the Reformation hath always owned, there could be no queſtion of uſing the Pſalter of *David*, for an Inſtrument to tune the devotion of Chriſtian people, by; transforming the expreſſions of *David* unto our Lord Chriſt, in the firſt place; and, according to the Figure of Chriſt, to the Whole Church firſt, and then to every particular member of it. He that hath learnt this from the Whole Church, will never think it reaſon, to put this part of Gods Service to ſilence, whoſoever they be, that deſire or deſign it. He will rather indeavour, to reduce the ſinging of them into Pariſh Churches; being evidently ſo much eaſier, then the ſinging of the Pſalms in Rhime. But howſoever, retain the reading of them by Antiphones, and not *quench the Spirit* of God, which breatheth forth that transformation whereof I ſpake. Having thus inſtanced, I will not propoſe the Ground, upon which I maintain, that all Reformation

tion is to proceed, for the condition of the Conference which I propoſe. I will think it a point of that *Forbearance*, which S. *Paul* commandeth the Romans, not to inſiſt upon thoſe terms, which the Authority of the Apoſtles doth inforce. Becauſe I ſee him, not inſiſt upon the Authority of an Apoſtle, with them; but, having infallibly proved his ground, of Juſtification by Faith alone, forbear the conſequence of it; charging the Romans, to hold that indifferent, whatſoever his Authority, ſo grounded, declareth ſuch; yet charging them to forbear thoſe, that, for all his Authority and Reaſons, underſtood it not. For, I believe verily, that his reaſon and mine is the very ſame; Namely, to keep both Parties in the Unity of one Church, a Member of the Whole; Hoping that, by Gods bleſſing, upon the advantages, which the communication of the Faithful one with another, and with their Clergy affordeth, thoſe that are now moſt keenly ſet againſt theſe little things, that are excepted at in the Act of Uniformity, may, by that condeſcenſion, which the Intereſt of Chriſtianity obliges all Parties to, come to underſtand the only Principle of Reformation and Unity

Unity both; The Authority of the Catholick Church, in all things not determined by Gods Law, which is only the Gospel under this time of Christianity. And I set before them, to that purpose, the example of the Jews; Who, for all the Forbearance commanded by S. *Paul*, having stopped their ears, at all his charms; with the Unity of the Church, have forfeited the Faith, hitherto irrecoverably. For, being fully perswaded, that without this Principle, it is not possible, either for this Church, or for any part of the Reformation, long to subsist; Can I fear any less, then the utter loss of Religion, for my dearest Country, and for the dearer Church of God in it?

CHAP. XXVII.

How Recusants may, or may not be punished as Idolaters.

IT remains that I say, what Penalties this Position makes competent to those, that refuse the Reformation thus limited. A thing easie for me to do, having declared the Ground, upon which the refusing of

of Christianity is punishable; Which the Reformation, hitherto, hath not been able to do. The Position of punishing Hereticks capitally is generally decryed by them; And yet we see *Servetus* and *Gentilis* put to death, at *Geneva* and *Bern*; and others elsewhere. If, because sentenced for Hereticks by them that put them to death; Why should not the Powers that adhere to the Church of *Rome* execute the Sentence thereof, upon those whom they pronounce Hereticks? If, because so sentenced by the Primitive Church, in which we both agree; Why owne we not the Primitive Church in the rest, as well as in that? If, because they that gave the Sentence are competent Judges in Religion; What remains, but that contrary Sentences be executed by the Sword, and Religion be no otherwise judged? But, supposing Religion, and the Church, and the sense of the Scripture Visible, so far as the preserving of Unity requires; Christian Powers must both protect Subjects in their Civil, as well as natural being, though not true Christians; and yet punish them for not being true Christians. Only, if they pretend freedom from Allegiance, by

Christianity, (and we know it is false Christianity that so pretends) there will be also fit time to declare, why they may be capitally punished. But those who declare the Pope Antichrist, and the Papists Idolaters in the exercise of their Religion, have not declared, what Penalty is competent to their Idolatry. And yet, till that be cleared, we are in the clouds. This difficulty, I find my self able to look in the face, without ever disputing, whether the Papists, by their Religion, are bound to commit Idolatry, or not. The Law of *Moses*, indeed, seems to shew, that, by the Law of Nature, Idolaters may be put to death, for their Idolatry. For, there is no appearance, that the Law of God would have injoyned that, which the Law of Nature allows not. But the Case is otherwise under Christianity, then under the Law of *Moses*. The people of *Israel* held the Land of Promise, upon Condition, not to suffer any other God to be worshipped within the Bounds of it, but the true God, that gave it them upon those terms. Therefore they committed a forfeit, whensoever they suffered Idolatry in it. But the Gospel was preached to the Roman Empire,

Empire, consisting of two Religions, of Jews and Gentiles; Maintaining the State of the World upon the same terms which it found; saving that, which, if they imbraced the Faith, they must voluntarily change. When therefore the Soveraign Power of the Empire came to profess the Faith; (and thereupon, an obligation to maintain and propagate it, by all means, which the Right of Soveraign Power furnishes) they could not answer God, for the right use of their Power, using any other means, then the Interest of Christianity allows. They might have confiscated Estates, where they might have taken away lives; But that would have made the meekness, which Christianity pretendeth, to appear that Hypocrisie of our Sects; Who are always humble, always for Toleration, till they get the Power into their own hands. To shut up the Temples of Idols, and to forbid Sacrifices, was no more then to suppress that Sacriledge, which the light and Law of Nature discovereth. If any of the Imperial Laws make it death to sacrifice; it is to be understood, upon presumption, that those Sacrifices were Inquiries into the life of the Prince, or of their

enemies. To conſtrain them to be Chriſtians by Penalties, had been to make them counterfeit Chriſtians. Beſides, the Nations that bordered upon the Empire were all Idolaters; And Chriſtianity pretended to convert them, as well as the Empire. If the Emperors had puniſhed their Subjects, being Gentiles, for being Idolaters, muſt not the Neighbour Nations have perſecuted the Chriſtians, their Subjects, for being Chriſtians? The reaſon of the difference between the Law and the Goſpel, in this behalf, is that which S. *Auſtin* giveth, why the Law of *Moſes* voids the Marriages of Jews with Gentiles; Whereas S. *Paul* adviſes thoſe that turned Chriſtians, being married to Idolaters, to continue in Wedlock with them, deſiring it. S. *Auſtins* reaſon is this; That the Law, tendring only temporal promiſes expreſly, (which Gentiles as well as Jews, might & did injoy in this world) thought it too hard a temptation, to truſt a Jew in Wedlock with a Gentile; by whom, he might be in danger to be ſeduced, to proſperous Idolatry. Whereas Chriſtianity, upon the advantage of the world to come, aſſured by the Preaching of our Lord and his Apoſtles, challengeth all

all other Religions, as unable to reſiſt it, when it is performed as well as profeſſed. So that to ſuffer Idolaters, in converſing with Chriſtians, was but the allowing of opportunity, for the converting of Idolaters. I think I have cauſe to make this an argument *ad hominem*, that our Sectaries themſelves cannot, nor do require the Penalty of Idolatry, by *Moſes* Law, upon Papiſts. They that remember the time, when the late Q. Mother of Royal memory came over, do know, what infuſions the Pulpits then made, into the minds of the people, of the curſe of God hanging upon the Nation, for His Majeſties Marriage. The pretenſe was wholly, upon the Law of *Moſes*; Which, as I have ſhewed, is not to the purpoſe among Chriſtians. But indeed, thoſe prognoſtications were no other, then the Propheſies of the Devils Oracles, among the Gentiles; Foretelling the miſchiefs, which they intended or deſired to do themſelves. This being a ſufficient reaſon, why the ſame pretenſe is not now on foot, becauſe it cannot be plauſible, after ſo dear experience of the miſchief it tends to; I think I am to take advantage of it, in behalf of Truth and Juſtice; That

no Party can pretend, the Penalty of *Moſes* Law to lye, in our Caſe; Suppoſing, not granting the Papiſts to be Idolaters, according to *Moſes* Law. And is not the Caſe the ſame, between the Reformation and the See of *Rome*? At leaſt it is ſo, if the Reformation be that which it pretendeth. For then, the advantage muſt needs be ſo Viſible, that to allow converſation between the Profeſſions that are at ſuch diſtance, is but to allow the means of bringing all Popiſh Recuſants to Church; when the Reformation is that, which it pretendeth. I grant that it falls out to be otherwiſe, in our experience. For, they that are converted to the See of *Rome*, at this time, are converted by this miſcarriage, that they venture themſelves into diſpute with thoſe, which they are not able to deal with. But the miſcarriage is accidental; Becauſe of the Diviſions within our ſelves; ariſing from hence, that our Reformation owneth not the Bounds which it requireth. For, by this means, the Clergy of this Church is in contempt with their Flock; and private Chriſtians venture themſelves into diſpute with Recuſants, (that is, with their Prieſts) without truſting their Paſtors,

or

or acquainting them with what they do. Which if they did do, in due time, ſuch occaſions would be opportunities of reducing Recuſants to Church. Beſides, to purſue the Idolatry of the See of *Rome*, (ſuppoſing, not granting that ſo it is) what would it be, but to draw the Sword on both ſides, to try the quarrel of Religion with? And therefore Soveraign Powers cannot give God account, that they uſe the Right he gives them over Papiſts their Subjects, purſuing them to the Penalty of *Moſes* Law, as Idolaters. There is another reaſon for the ſame, that appears now and then, in the diſputes of them, that maintain the Religion of the See of *Rome* to be Idolatrous. For, they have many times found themſelves obliged to grant, that their Idolatry is another kind of Idolatry, then that which is prohibited, and puniſhed with death, by the Law of *Moſes*. And if ſo, it muſt be another kind of Penalty, that belongs to it. Now I ſuppoſe S. *Paul* ſays true, that *Covetouſneſs is Idolatry*, and that, there be thoſe that make their *Belly their God*. And whoſoever underſtands the difference between the Old and the New Teſtament, will allow, that S. *Hierom* under-

ſtood it; Who, in his Commentaries upon the Prophets, makes all that they, the Prophets ſay, againſt the Idolatry of the ten Tribes, to belong to the Hereſies and Schiſms of Chriſtians; and, all Hereticks and Schiſmaticks to be Idolaters, in the myſtical ſenſe of the Old Teſtament, under the New. Which is no more, then our Lord ſays of the Samaritans; *That they worſhipped they knew not what*; At ſuch time when it was well enough known, that the Samaritans were no Idolaters; worſhipping the only true God of *Iſrael*. For certainly, though all Superſtition be not Idolatry, yet all Idolatry is Superſtition; Becauſe the chief of Superſtitions is Idolatry. All Superſtitions ſtand upon the ſame ground as Idolatry, and aim at the ſame mark. Man is ſenſible, by that Conſcience, which the light of Nature creates, that one true God is to be worſhipped; And that as himſelf ſhall require, not as his Creature is willing to allow. And being therefore ſenſible, that Concupiſcence allows him not that Service, which Conſcience requires, they are willing to pay him in Coin of their own ſtamping; Uſurping the Prerogative of his Soveraignty, even in that, whereby

whereby they pretend to pay their Allegiance. Is there any other ſourſe of Idolatry but this? For, is it not reaſonable to think, that men can ſatisfie themſelves, and put off the Gods they have made themſelves, with that, which the jealous God, the true God will not be ſerved with? And therefore, Religion teaches, that Idolatry is the Worſhip of the Devil. Not only, becauſe he teaches it; But becauſe he holds the Opinion of a God, by correſponding with Idolaters in their Idolatries. And what is all Superſtition, but redeeming the Service of God in Spirit and Truth, by the ſervice of our Bodies or Eſtates; which may be done, when the inward man is not ſubject to God? Such are the Invocations of Saints, the Worſhipping of their Reliques and Images, the Pilgrimages and Indulgences commended or commanded by the See of *Rome*; And ſuch they may be owned to be, by him that dare not undertake them to be that Idolatry, that was puniſhable with death by the Law of *Moſes*. And being ſuch, it will be puniſhable in all, who, for an undue reſpect to the See of *Rome*, will not have their fellow-ſubjects freed from ſuperſtitious cuſtoms; Nor obey

obey the Laws of their Country, that give them this freedom. But if this be the due Reaſon, for which it is puniſhable; the ſame Reaſon will render them puniſhable, who think they ſerve God, by running into Conventicles, in deſpite of the Laws of God and their Country. For, what is that, but a pretenſe of paying the debt of Religion, which Chriſtianity makes due to God, by worſhipping an Idol of their own ſetting up? That is, as I ſaid afore, by worſhipping God according to an Imagination of their own erecting; and not according to that, which the common Chriſtianity requires. And thus I am come to the Concluſion, which I intended, without diſputing, whether or no, the Papiſts, by their Religion, do exerciſe that Idolatry, which is puniſhable by death in *Moſes* Law. For if capital Penalty lye not in our Caſe; If it be agreed upon, that they are puniſhable upon the ſame Ground, for which the other ſort of Recuſants are puniſhable; then is the way clear before me, to proceed to declare, what Penalties, both ſorts of Recuſants are to be, or may be puniſhed with: Suppoſing our Reformation confined within thoſe Bounds, which the

the Faith and the Laws of the Catholick Church either determine or allow.

CHAP. XXVIII.

All that take Arms againſt the Soveraign, to Reform Religion, may be liable to Capital Puniſhment.

BUt if the Papiſts cannot be liable to capital puniſhment, as Idolaters, neither can they be liable to it, as limbs of Antichriſt. The name of Antichriſt is a challenge of Soveraign Power; Becauſe the name of Chriſt is ſo; Signifying a Prince and a Prophet, raiſed and ſetled by Gods immediate Word, which is the Soveraign Title. For *Antichriſt* can ſignifie nothing, but a counterfeit Chriſt; One that pretends to be Chriſt, and is not; Our Lord Chriſt being the Meſſias, which the Fathers and Prophets from the beginning expected. But the Soveraignty of Chriſt is declared by himſelf, to be a meer Spiritual Soveraignty; which all the Jews, even the Apoſtles before our Lords death, expected to be a temporal Kingdom. And therefore, whoſoever

ſoever it is, that groundeth Soveraignty upon Chriſtianity, though he be not Antichriſt for that, yet is he the enemy of all Chriſtian States, for it. And ſo are the Subjects of all Chriſtian States, that think themſelves free of their Allegiance to Princes, or States, Excommunicated by the Pope. And upon this account, I deny not, that Papiſts may become liable to capital puniſhment, or to baniſhment with confiſcation; Which ſeems to be, of the two, the greater puniſhment. But this, neither common to all Papiſts, nor proper to Papiſts alone. For, that this is not the Faith of all Papiſts, I need no more, then the diſtance between the Secular Prieſts and the Jeſuits here, to prove. And that it is not proper to Papiſts alone, I need no more, then the Scottiſh Covenant, and the troubles of the three Kingdoms upon it, to prove. And therefore, it is a thing abſolutely neceſſary, to make thoſe Penalties juſt, which the Laws inflict upon the Papiſts; that they diſtinguiſh between the Cauſe of Religion, common to all, and the Cauſe of them, that make it a point of Religion, to violate their Allegiance to a Soveraign depoſed by the Pope. Nay it will be neceſſa-

neceſſary, in point of Juſtice, to impoſe the ſame Penalties, upon all of all Religions, that may think themſelves diſcharged of their Allegiance, upon any account of Religion whatſoever. It is manifeſt, that they who take Arms againſt their Soveraign, to reform Religion, do ground themſelves upon the Title of Religion, and think themſelves tyed by their Chriſtianity to do it; As they who take Arms againſt their Prince, depoſed by the Pope, think themſelves tyed in Chriſtianity, to execute his Sentence. Thoſe whom the people follow, in reforming Religion againſt the will of their Soveraign; Thoſe they make as much Judges, in reforming Religion, as the other do the Pope. And all that refuſe to ſecure their Soveraign by Oath, that they will neither lead nor follow any man, in reforming Religion, without his Authority, deſerve to be out of the protection of that *Sword*, which he *weareth not in vain*. They fall into the Caſe of the Jews, expecting the Meſſias; For, when they imagine, that he is come, they will think themſelves diſpenſed with, by their Religion, for any Bond of Allegiance. But Chriſtian Princes and States are not wont,

ſo

ſo far as I know, to think themſelves ſecured by the Oath of Jews. Let this be a difference, which they make between Jews and Chriſtians, to take the Oath of their Chriſtian Subjects, for ſecurity of their Allegiance; Becauſe true Chriſtianity obliges all good Chriſtians, to bear Allegiance to their Soveraigns, not to be diſpenſed with, upon any account of Chriſtianity; Notwithſtanding we ſee, that there are thoſe, that count themſelves the beſt Chriſtians, that do think themſelves diſpenſed with in their Allegiance, upon divers and ſeveral accounts of their Chriſtianity. But let this Kingdom, having had tryal of contrary pretenſes, think it ſelf bound, to declare the ſame Penalties, againſt the ſame Crimes; And able to impoſe the utmoſt Penalties, upon all that ſhall refuſe, to ſecure their Soveraign by Oath, of their Allegiance. And ſince the allowance, which the Law makes, in underſtanding the Oath of Supremacy, evidences, that it may be underſtood, in a ſenſe offenſive, in point of Religion; let it be thought time, to antiquate the old, and to inact a new form, that may tye all Subjects as Subjects, without pretenſe of offending any Religion,

Religion; by condemning all Religions, that make difficulty to undertake it, for irreligious.

CHAP. XXIX.

What Penalties the Protection of Religion requires.

NOw I am to ſay, how far Chriſtian Powers are to puniſh Hereticks and Schiſmaticks. For, it is too late for me to ſay, that they may puniſh their Conventicles, having declared the reaſon, why they may do it; And being now only to draw the conſequence of that reaſon, how far they are to do, or may do it. Here, I muſt firſt marvel at our Independents; ſome of whom have diſputed, in very good earneſt, that it is not lawful, for Civil Powers, to impoſe Penalties upon Religion. Whereas the World knows, that there never was any ſuch Religion in the World, as that of Independents, before the planting of *New England*. And that ſince, thoſe that framed Independent Congregations there, upon a Covenant, whereby they renounce

nounce *One Catholick Church*, and *One Baptiſm for Remiſſion of Sins*; have not only baniſhed Antinomians, and put Quakers to death; But have impoſed a Penalty of five ſhillings a Lords-day, upon all that come not to hear their Sermons. For, though this Penalty is not ſtrictly exacted at preſent, yet it lyes at preſent. Whereby, the greater part of His Majeſties Subjects in that Plantation, are not only hindred, from exerciſing the Religion injoyned by the Laws of this Kingdom; But alſo their Children dye unbaptized, themſelves live and dye without the Communion of the Euchariſt, and, in fine, their Souls are murthered, by this Tyranny of their miſbelieving fellow-Subjects. Whether all this by their *Patent*, or by *Uſurpation*, I leave to thoſe that may redreſs it, to judge. But, if the Protection of Religion, and of the Church lye, in maintaining thoſe Rights, which the Soveraign Power finds the Church poſſeſt of, when it undertakes the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity; And all the Right of the Church, (which it hath, by the meer conſent of thoſe that voluntarily undertake Chriſtianity) reſolves into Excommunication; Then is not the Church

Church protected in the Rights of it, by Chriſtian Powers, unleſs their Laws inable the Excommunication of the Church to lay hold on all their Subjects. Nor can any inconvenience follow hereupon; Becauſe the Excommunication of the Church, when it is protected by the Civil Power, can never proceed, but upon Cauſes which the Law allows. Now, there are two ſorts of Excommunicate perſons, according to the Premiſes; One are they that *Excommunicate themſelves*; the other, they that are Excommunicated by the Church. For, though they Excommunicate themſelves, yet, becauſe they are to be *avoided* by the Flock, from whence they depart, when they Excommunicate themſelves, they are to be held, as if they were Excommunicate by the Church. Now, if they who thus Excommunicate themſelves ſhould be under no Penalty of Civil Power, for ſo doing, I would fain know, what that Protection, which Chriſtian Powers muſt needs owne, to the Chriſtianity which themſelves profeſs, can avail it. For, if the Church Excommunicate thoſe that perform not the Chriſtianity which they profeſs, and the Excommunicate be free

to run into the Conventicles of those that Excommunicate themselves, who will care for performing the Christianity which he professeth? Or how shall the Church and Religion subsist, when no man need to care for performing the Christianity which he professeth? This is the danger which is come so near, to bring this Church to nothing, at this time. On the one side, all Papists Excommunicate themselves, on the other side, all that run into Conventicles. The Papists, we all know, are under Penalties grievous enough; If we speak of that part, which doth not decline their Allegiance. As for those that do, I have already set the consideration of them aside. And yet there is this Apology, for the severity of those Laws; That they do take off the Penalty of perpetual imprisonment, which by the Ancient Laws of the Kingdom, introduced under the Papacy, lyes against all that are Excommunicate; And therefore is to lye, against all that Excommunicate themselves. If there be a reason, why such severe Laws should be in force against them, can any, that wears the face of a man, say, why *the other sort of Recusants* should be free from all Penalties?

Penalties? I think the World is ſenſible hereof, in the ſuſpenſion of the Penal Laws againſt the Recuſants; Which, under his late Majeſty, was charged with ſuch violent jealouſies: and now paſſes without diſcontent, becauſe there is neither conſcience nor ſhame, to levy thoſe Penalties upon them, and none upon the Conventicles. In the mean time, *Atheiſm*, *Prophaneneſs*, *Blaſphemy*, *Apoſtaſie*, *Hereſie* ſhelter themſelves under the Communion of the Church, which the Laws protect; and will needs be of that Religion, which they may profeſs, and need not perform. And, how long this Church can continue this Church, upon thoſe terms, let thoſe judge, whom it concerns. My buſineſs is only this; That, if thoſe that Excommunicate themſelves be under no Penalty, thoſe that are Excommunicate by the Church need not care, that they are Excommunicate. And ſo the Church is not protected, becauſe the Excommunication of the Church is not in force; That is, it is no Penalty to be Excommunicate, to all that can *think it is none.* And therefore, unleſs it draw a *Penalty of this World* after it; that all may have occaſion to avoid the Penalty of the World to come,

by avoiding the Penalty of this World; the Church is not protected. It may be thought, that the Church is protected nevertheleſs, by the *Priviledge* of receiving the Tyths, of thoſe that decline it, and of the Truſt it manages, of diſpenſing Church-goods. And this is, indeed, part of the Penalty, by which they redeem their Recuſancy; In as much, as they are put to maintain the Religion which they invent; Church-goods, though they be *Publick goods*, yet, being originally affected to the maintenance of that Church, which the Law protecteth. But that, being a Penalty of their own choice, ſatisfies not the Protection of the Religion which the Kingdom profeſſeth; until the Law make it a *diſgrace*, and a degree of *Infamy*, to ſtand Excommunicate, whether by themſelves, or by the Church. And, ſeeing all Diſcipline, even that of the Clergy, ends in Excommunication; To maintain the Revenue, and let go Diſcipline, would be, *to ſell Religion* for the Revenue of the Church. For what would this be, but a tempting of the debauched, into the Service of the Church, when there is no Diſcipline, to reſtrain their debauches? The complaints

of

of this time ſhew this to be a Perſecution, which the *Sects* of the time *bring upon the Church*. For, Diſcipline is releaſed, for fear to ſtir, and for hope to gain Sectaries; and the fault is laid upon the Clergy, that ſuffer in the releaſing of Diſcipline. But Chriſtian Powers are bound, not only not to perſecute the Church themſelves, but not to ſuffer Sects to perſecute it. And to avoid trouble, by releaſing Diſcipline, may be the way to find it, in the means of avoiding it. Certainly, till Excommunication (which is the *utmoſt reſort* of all Diſcipline) be in force, we cannot ſay we have a Church; but only, becauſe we have Laws, by which it ought to be in force; And becauſe we hope to have Laws, by which it will be in force. Men may amuſe themſelves, with the inſtance of the *United Provinces*; which, they ſay, flouriſh in trade and riches, by maintaining all Religions. But the queſtion is of Religion, not of Trade, nor Riches. If it could be ſaid, that their Religion is improved, with their Trade, the example were conſiderable. But, they that would reſtore and improve the Religion, that flouriſhed in *England* thirty years ago, muſt not take up with

the *baſe Alloy* of that which is ſeen in the *United Provinces*. Nor is this a reproach to them, but a truth of Gods Word; that Religion and Trade cannot be both at once at the height. Beſides, there is a *Religion of the State* in the *United Provinces*: and other Religions are tolerated there, becauſe they were in being before the State was ſetled, or contributed to the ſetling of it, upon expectation of being tolerated in their Religions, when it ſhould be ſetled. But when the *United Provinces* were in danger to break in pieces, upon a Diſpute in Religion, in the year 1618. and when the point of Religion was decided by the point of that Sword, which inabled the *States General* to give Law to the States of *Holland*; Let him, that now may ſee more Aprons then Clokes come from their Arminian Congregations, tell me, whether the point were decided by a Penalty, or not. But let him tell me alſo, whether it had not been better, to have decided it no further, then the Catholick Church had decided it; then to indanger the Reformation, (as now it is in danger, by admitting the Socinians into Communion with the Arminians) in caſe the Penalty ſhould prove

prove insufficient. As for the Discourses, that threaten the transporting of Estates, upon Penalties for Religion; and, that would incourage strangers to plant and improve Trade here; Who knows not, that the Conventicles now Usurped were first erected by the late War? And therefore must be presumed to cherish the pretense of it. And how easie is it, for those that inact Penalties for Religion, to provide, that it be for no mans ease, to declare himself an *enemy to his Country?* Nor let any man think, that strangers are affected in Religion, as those at home are; who pretend, by Religion, *to give Law to their Country.* The dissensions on foot among us may well discourage them from planting among us, to improve Trade with us. The improving of the Reformation, and the setling of it, would be but an incouragement to them, to pass by those frivolous pretenses, which carry us to these frantick distances. In the mean time, be it considered, that Independency, which was not *in rerum natura* at the planting of *New England*, being once setled there, by the pretense which their Patent or Patents gave, became so fruitful, that within twenty years, they

were able to cut off their Prince. For, all that love truth muſt acknowledge, that they were Independents that did that horrible Act. And then conſider, how you would hope to have it reſtrained, if S. *Pauls* precept of avoiding Sectaries that Excommunicate themſelves be not in force, by Canonical Penalties, upon them that are to *avoid*; And by temporal Penalties, upon them that are to be *avoided*. For, converſing together, otherwiſe then for Trade and Commerce, experience ſhews, that infection is unavoidable. And therefore the Protection, which the Kingdom owes the Religion which it profeſſeth, neceſſarily requires, not only, that it be maintained in that Plantation; But that it be maintained, *at the Charge of the Schiſmaticks* in it. For, as that is the proper Penalty, for them to redeem their Recuſancy with; So is it the Juſtice, which they owe their fellow-Subjects, whom they have hitherto kept in that Ægyptian Bondage. And this Reaſon will extend the ſame obligation, to all other Plantations and Reſidences of Engliſh; To wit, that, if they be ſuffered to live in another Religion there, account may be taken of them here,

here, that they be not *admitted to Communion* here, without renouncing that which they lived in there. That they be not ſuffered there, without maintaining the Religion profeſſed here. It extends alſo to French and Dutch, and all Forreign Churches, that, for Trade, or otherwiſe, may be allowed to plant here. For, either they hold Communion with this Church, or not. If not, it muſt be Penal, both for thoſe of this Church, to Communicate with them, and for them, to admit thoſe of this Church. If ſo, yet, ſo long as there is cauſe of jealouſie, there muſt be proviſion, that neither Church be declined, upon any pretenſe of ſuch jealouſie. I will here add one thing, before I make an end; Becauſe it may be demanded, how the Law of the Land may make Excommunication turn to *diſgrace*, and to ſome degree of *Infamy*. The anſwer is; Let the Law of the Land provide, that no man may have *Chriſtian Burial*, (that is, be buried in *Conſecrate ground*, and *with the Office of the Church*) but he whom his Curate knows to have received the Communion within the year; And, I believe, the moſt part of them that Excommunicate them-

themſelves will return of themſelves. But then it muſt be provided, and the Biſhop muſt be inabled by Law, to diſcharge that Curate of *Office* and *Benefice*, that ſhall falſifie his truſt in that point. Now give me leave to demand, whether the Church be under *Protection*, or under *Perſecution*; If the Curate be not inabled by Law, to refuſe Chriſtian Burial to thoſe, of whoſe Salvation he can give no account, becauſe they withdraw themſelves from his Cure.

CHAP. XXX.

The Condition of reconciling Recuſants.

BUt this is not all; There is one point yet behind. For, whenſoever the Church Excommunicates for notorious and ſcandalous ſin, to reſtore him that is ſo Excommunicate to Communion would be to murther his Soul, and Chriſtianity both at once; not ſuppoſing ſome proportionable preſumption of amendment, in him that is reſtored. This therefore *muſt hold, as the Reaſon of it holds*, in thoſe that Excommunicate themſelves; In the recon-

reconciling of Hereticks and Schiſmaticks to the Church. And this, the practice of the Whole Church of God from the beginning ſhews them, that are willing to underſtand the reaſon of it, before they tread that Authority under foot, which the common Chriſtianity obliges all to follow. Shew me any Hereſie or Schiſm ever reſtored to the Church, without renouncing the ſame, and I will confeſs, that the *Church it ſelf turned Heretick or Schiſmatick* from the ſame date. Only there is a difference to be put, between Hereſie and Schiſm, and other *Perſonal Crimes*. For, I ſee no reaſon, why we ſhould not call other Crimes Perſonal, in oppoſition to Hereſie and Schiſm; Becauſe we call it not Hereſie or Schiſm, till *Separation* be made. A falſe Belief in Fundamentals is Hereſie before God, a Reſolution to divide the Church is Schiſm before God, both deſtructive to Salvation, before Separation be made. But Separation is the diſeaſe we pretend to cure, without prejudicing the health of Gods Church. And therefore, ſhould Separation be made to maintain a Profeſſion, that *Simony*, for example, or *Sacriledge*, or any other deadly Crime is

no

no ſin, the Party ſo formed would be, *ipſo facto*, an Hereſie. Perſonal Crimes, then, muſt be reſtored to Communion, upon preſumption of Perſonal Converſion from the ſame. But Hereſies and Schiſms becoming *Bodies*, by profeſſing an *Ingagement*, may be re-united to the Church in *Body*, renouncing the Separation in which they ſtood ingaged. For, there is reaſonable preſumption, that the *Leaders* would not renounce, if they did not repent them of it. As for the *People*, that only follows and leads not, it is moſt true and juſt to maintain, that Hereſie and Schiſm is a Bar to Salvation; though we allow hope of Salvation to the ſimple, that follow malicious Leaders, out of invincible ignorance. It is therefore no blemiſh to the Church, to receive them, as they departed, in company of their Leaders. For their Salvation is provided for, when the Bar is removed. The experience of our Caſe makes this conſiderable. At His Majeſties Return, it was inacted, that ſuch Uſurpers, as were poſſeſſed of *dead Places*, ſhould hold, without inquiring, whether *Ordained* or not. Whereby it might ſeem to them, that found no fault with their own Title, that

that the Law of the Kingdom owned their Ordinations to be good. But without cauſe. For, the Kingdom being then under that *Force*, which was not as yet removed, (a thing manifeſt enough; The Church not being yet reſtored) the retaining of them, (which I am neither to juſtifie nor to blame) was nothing but the induring of that Force upon Part, rather then call in queſtion the *Whole*. But hereupon, they that had got this colour for their Poſſeſſion, were not like to diſowne that Ordination, which the Law of the Land had ſeemed thus far to owne. So, the way was paved for the Schiſm on foot, by refuſing the Act of Uniformity, when they were imployed, without reconciling themſelves to the Church, by foregoing their Schiſm. Some may think, that I abate more then this, for their ſakes, when I allow them *Satisfaction by Conference*; yea and Laws to be changed for their ſatisfaction, if juſt cauſe may appear. But it is no more then I would allow *Popiſh Recuſants*, to juſtifie the Penalties, that will be always neceſſary, becauſe they prefer the Authority of the See of *Rome*, (forbidding all Treaty of Religion without it) before the common Chri-

Christianity, requiring Reformation in the Christianity of the Kingdom. For, do not they deserve those Penalties, who refuse to assist their Country, in a work so concerning the common Salvation, upon just terms? This I am sure, supposing satisfaction, there can be no difficulty in departing from *Usurped Ordinations*, and from the Schism grounded upon the same. And therefore, it is only the *solemnity of Renouncing* that is abated, and the *Irregularity* that is pardoned; And that, by the example of the first Great Council, in the Case of the Meletians. And that, because they renounce not the Catholick Church, but acknowledge a *National Church*; Which they cannot acknowledge, upon due grounds, but they must acknowledge the Catholick Church. And therefore, I say not the same of the Independents; Who are *Banded* into a Profession destructive to it, upon a *Covenant*. For that Covenant is it, that must be expressly and formally renounced, before they can be capable of *Communion* with the Church; And much more of *Orders*. To grant them Communion otherwise, is to make the Church guilty of their Schism, which it alloweth. And so,

ſo, to give Popiſh Recuſants a juſt cauſe to refuſe Communion with it. As for other Sects of Antinomians, Anabaptiſts, and the like; When any man knows, upon what Grounds they Excommunicate themſelves, and how far they are Banded into Sects, it will then be no difficult thing to ſay, how they are to be Reconciled, ſo as their Schiſms and Hereſies may be duely Renounced. A thing which muſt be conſidered, in thoſe that were Preſbyterians, before they broke into Conventicles. For, ſince that came to paſs, who ſhall warrant, that they have been guided by none but ſuch, as have Preſbyterian Orders? Or that they ſtand now to that Religion, which the Rebellion once made Law to the Kingdom? Which if they do not, who ſhall warrant, or how ſhall the Church be ſatisfied, that they do depart from their Schiſms, with their Leaders? And indeed, the Independents, though they be Banded into a Sect, by a Covenant; yet, if once they be diſbanded, who ſhall anſwer for them, that they will follow their Leaders? And all this by virtue of the Sacriledge, whereby they all betray the *Authority of the Church*; and with it the Chriſtian

Christian Faith, to the *Will of their People*, to debauch them into the same Schism with themselves. Which if it be considered, perhaps it will appear, that the *Forbearance* which I have granted, can, for this reason, extend no further, then to the *Persons* of those that deserted their Churches, rather then submit to the Act of Uniformity. Nor shall it trouble me, if my Opinion be found to come to no more. For the Opinions of private persons are to content themselves, with declaring *what may be*; Leaving them that are concerned, to judge what is. But, as for the way of Reconciling those which shall be converted, to the Church; in that, the *Apostolical Wisdom of the Primitive Catholick Church* is of necessity to take place. For, Schism or Heresie being the Bar to the effect of Baptism, which is the *Gift of the Holy Ghost*; And the renouncing of it being the removing of that Bar; It follows, that all that shall return are to be reconciled by *Confirmation*, as always they were reconciled to the Primitive Catholick Church. This were easier done, could it be presumed, that all would follow their Leaders. But if that cannot be presumed, if they must

be

be reconciled one by one, yet is that no more, than the work of an *Episcopal Visitation, from Parish to Parish*: A thing practised and usual in the Church, after the building of Parish-Churches, in the worst of those times, in which, the Canons which I have commended took place. But now, as for Quakers, we are no more to reckon them *among Christians, then the Gnosticks and Manichees of Old, then the Mahumetans at present.* For they do openly owne, the Dictate of their own Spirits to be as much *the Word of God* as the Scriptures. And that is as much, as serves to create all such new Sects, as, acknowledging the Scriptures so far as they please, introduce the pretenses of their own Revelations, where they think fit. For, when the *private Spirit* is equalled with *Gods Word*, the last Dictate, as in mens *last Wills*, must of necessity take place. Only this difference; That, whereas *Gnosticks, Manichees, Mahumetans*, followed, or do follow their Leaders Spirit, Quakers follow every one their own. And therefore are the more contemptible, and the more reducible, whensoever a course shall be established. Certainly, did they see, that they cannot

be reconciled but as ſo many *Renegades*, they would bethink themſelves, before they went on in their madneſs. Eſpecially, did the Law ſet before them, that this their Poſition is not reconcileable to *Civil Truſt*: Always obliging them, to the moſt deſperate Acts of Treaſon, and violence to their Country, that they can imagine *their own Spirit* to dictate. Upon which account, it cannot be beyond the merit of their madneſs, that they are made *ſervi pœnæ* by Law, as the Roman Laws call it; That is, that they are tranſported to work in the Plantations. For, they that take upon them to impoſe upon their Country, that the *Offices of common Civility* are *Acts of Idolatry*; What is not to be expected from their madneſs, who, as the Caſe is, dare pretend, that it ought to be Law to all Chriſtians? But, ſince the Law is to provide for ſuch People, it is manifeſt, that it is to provide, that they may not fail of the truſt which the Church and Kingdom enters into, with thoſe whom they receive to Communion, but that they muſt fail of the Civil Truſt of Subjects; That is, that their *Teſtimonies be not receivable in Law*, that they be diſabled to *ſue at Law*, that

that they be disabled to make *Wills*, or to get by Wills, or any thing else within the effect of Civil Trust. And this must also be the Penalty of the *Leviathan*, and all that have or may follow him, either into *Apostasie* or *Atheism*. For, they who declare themselves at freedom, to forswear the Christian Faith, can never be held by any bond of Civil Trust. It must also be the Penalty of all Sects, that may *relapse*, after they may have been reconciled; At least in that Proportion, which, that part of the Faith, which their respective Sect denieth, holds, to the whole Profession of Christianity; which *Apostacy* and *Atheism* destroy at once. For, it may be a Question, why the Kingdom should be counted a Christian Kingdom, if the Laws of it set not some mark of *Infamy* or *Disgrace* upon the enemies of Christianity, according to the Rate of their Enmity; Which, only the inforcing of Excommunication, by the Laws, can do.

FINIS.

Books Printed for and Sold by James Collins *at the* Kings-Head *in* Weſtminſter-Hall.

A Blow at *Modern Sadduciſm*, in ſome Philoſophical Conſiderations about *Witchcraft*. To which is added, The Relation of the *Famed Diſturbance* by the *Drummer*, in the Houſe of M. *Mompeſſon*. With ſome Reflections on *Drollery* and *Atheiſm*.

Plus ultra; or the Progreſs and Advancement of Knowledge ſince the days of *Ariſtotle*. *Octavo*.

A *Loyal Tear* drop'd on the *Vault* of our late *Martyr'd Soveraign*, in an *Anniverſary Sermon* on the day of his *Murther*. *Quarto*.

All three by *Joſ. Glanvill*, A. M. and Rector of *Bath*.

The Triumphs of *Rome* over *Deſpiſed Proteſtancy*: Written by Biſhop *Hall*. *Octavo*.

A Sermon preached before the *Peers*, *Octob.* 10. 1666. being the Faſt-day for the late *Fire*: By *Seth* Lord Biſhop of *Oxon*. *Quarto*.

The *Practice* of *Serious Godlineſs*: Affectionately

fectionately recommended and directed in ſome Religious Counſels of a Pious Mother to her dear Daughters. 12°

A Diſcourſe of *Subterranean Treaſure*: By a Member of the Royal Society. 12°

The General Aſſembly: A Sermon by *Francis Fullwood*. D. D. *Quarto*.

Forty Sermons by *Anthony Farindon*. B. B. *Fol.*

Rea's Flora, Ceres & Pomona. Fol.

Epiſcopacy Apoſtolical; or a Conſent of the Forreign Churches to the Diſcipline of the Church of *England*: Written by Biſhop *Moreton*, and publiſhed with a long Preface, by *Henry Yelverton* Baronet. *Octavo.*

A Diſcourſe of the Uſe of Reaſon in the Affairs of Religion againſt the preſent Opinions of the Sects of this Age. *Quarto.*

A *Private Conference* between a *RICH ALDERMAN* and a poor Country Vicar, made publick, wherein is diſcourſed the Obligation of Oaths which have been impoſed on the Subjects of *England*, with other matters relating to the preſent State of Affairs.